

THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE
ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

THE
NINETEEN - FORTY - NINE
YEARBOOK

THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

YEARBOOK

Containing the Association's year-end reports and the
proceedings of the Forty-Fourth annual convention at
New York, N.Y., January 13-14, 1950.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Register, 1950	
Officers of the Association	2
Rules Committees	3
Tournament Committees	6
Miscellaneous Committees	8
Roll of Members	
Active	9
Allied	19
Associate	26
Affiliated	26
Delegates and Visitors to the Convention	27
II. Yearbook, 1949	
Reports of the District Vice Presidents	33
Reports of the Rules and Tournament Committees	46
Meetings of the Executive Committee and Council	86
III. Proceedings of the Annual Convention	
Joint Meeting with A.F.C.A.	92
L. R. Meyer, President, A.F.C.A.	92
Karl E. Leib, President, N.C.A.A.	95
Round Table Meetings	101
Large College and University Group	
Subject: Television	101
Small College Group	
Speaker: William E. Stevenson	128
Subject: Sanity Code	137
Subject: Conducting Intercollegiate Athletics Independent of Gate Receipts	153
The Business Session	166
Report of the Secretary-Treasurer	166
Proposed Amendments	171
Report of the Constitutional Compliance Committee	180
Report of the Nominating Committee	208
Appendix I — Treasurer's Report and Financial Reports of 1949 Meets and Tournaments	211
Appendix II — Constitution	224
Executive Regulations	232
Eligibility Rules of N.C.A.A. Meets and Tournaments	238
Dates and Sites of 1950 Meets and Tournaments	241

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

1950

HONORARY PRESIDENTS

Professor Charles W. Kennedy
 Professor William B. Owens
 Professor Philip O. Badger
 Wilbur C. Smith, M.D.
 Dr. Karl E. Leib

PRESIDENT

Professor Hugh C. Willett
 University of Southern California

SECRETARY-TREASURER
 Kenneth L. Wilson
 Hotel Sherman, Chicago 1

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT
 Walter Byers
 Hotel Sherman, Chicago 1

THE COUNCIL

Director Lloyd P. Jordan, Amherst College, First District
 Director Carl P. Schott, Pennsylvania State College, Second District
 President H. C. Byrd, University of Maryland, Third District
 Dean Lloyd C. Emmons, Michigan State College, Fourth District
 Professor George Small, University of Tulsa, Fifth District
 Professor D. W. Williams, Texas A. & M. College, Sixth District
 Professor King Hendricks, Utah State Agr. College, Seventh District
 Professor H. P. Everest, University of Washington, Eighth District

Members at Large

Professor Earle Davis, Kansas State College
 Director Robert A. Fetzer, University of North Carolina
 Director Alfred Masters, Stanford University
 Dr. E. LeRoy Mercer, University of Pennsylvania
 Dean A. B. Moore, University of Alabama
 Director G. L. Rider, Miami University
 Director Harry Stuhldreher, University of Wisconsin

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Ike J. Armstrong University of Utah	Bernie Moore Southeastern Conference
Earl Fullbrook University of Nebraska	J. H. Nichols Oberlin College
Robert J. Kane Cornell University	James H. Stewart Southwest Conference
Asa S. Bushnell Eastern College Athletic Conference	

COMMITTEES FOR 1950

(Note: The Basketball, Football, Swimming and Track and Field Rules Committees are appointed on the "rotation-district representation" plan. For those committees the districts represented are indicated together with the years remaining in the term of appointment including 1950. All other committees are appointed annually from the membership-at-large. AL — denotes Members-at-large; NHSF — denotes National High School Federation appointee and representative.)

RULES COMMITTEES

Dist.	Committeeman	Institution	Term
Basketball Rules			
1st	Ray Oosting	Trinity College	1
2nd	Wm. H. Anderson	Lafayette College	4
3rd	Gus K. Tebell	University of Virginia	2
4th	Douglas R. Mills	University of Illinois	3
5th	Bruce Drake	University of Oklahoma	1
6th	Jack Gray	University of Texas	4
7th	L. C. Butler	Colorado St. Col. of Education	3
8th	Justin M. Barry	Univ. of Southern California	4
AL	George R. Edwards	University of Missouri	1
Chairman: George R. Edwards Rules Editor: Oswald Tower, Phillips Academy			

Football Rules

1st	D. O. McLaughry	Dartmouth College	4
2nd	Ellwood A. Geiges	Temple University	3
3rd	Wallace Wade	Duke University	1
4th	Carroll C. Widdoes	Ohio University	1
5th	Ernest C. Quigley	University of Kansas	4
6th	Madison Bell	Southern Methodist University	2
7th	E. L. Romney	Mountain States Conference	3
8th	A. L. Stiner	Oregon State College	2
AL	H. O. Crisler	University of Michigan	4
Chairman: H. O. Crisler Life Member: Amos Alonzo Stagg Secretary: E. E. Wieman			

Swimming Rules

1st	Karl B. Michael	Dartmouth College	1
2nd	Howard W. Stepp	Princeton University	1
3rd	R. E. Jamerson	University of North Carolina	4
4th	R. O. Papenguth	Purdue University	3
5th	Jack M. McGuire	Iowa State College	1
6th	A. D. Adamson	Texas A. & M. College	4
7th	G. W. Tompkin	Colorado A. & M. College	2

8th	Thomas G. Haynie	Stanford University	3
AL	Ed. T. Kennedy	Columbia University	4
NHSF	C. E. Forsythe	East Lansing, Michigan	
	Chairman: Edward T. Kennedy		
	Secretary: Howard W. Stepp		
	Guide Editor: Charles McCaffree, Jr., Michigan State		

Track and Field Rules

1st	Elliot B. Noyes	Dartmouth College	1
2nd	Charles D. Werner	Pennsylvania State College	3
3rd	R. A. Fetzer	University of North Carolina	2
4th	Larry N. Snyder	Ohio State University	3
5th	Ralph M. Higgins	Oklahoma A. & M. College	4
6th	Frank Anderson	Texas A. & M. College	1
7th	Ike J. Armstrong	University of Utah	2
8th	Robert L. Strehle	Pomona College	4
AL	Brutus Hamilton	University of California	4
NHSF	E. A. Thomas	Topeka, Kansas	
	Chairman: Brutus Hamilton		
	Secretary: Elliot B. Noyes		

Soccer Rules

Lawrence E. Briggs	University of Massachusetts
William Jeffrey	Pennsylvania State College
J. H. Nichols	Oberlin College
J. J. Reed	Princeton University
John Y. Squires	University of Connecticut
Charles R. Scott	University of Pennsylvania
Chairman: William Jeffrey	
Guide Editor: Alfred A. Smith, Germantown Friends School	

Boxing Rules

I. F. Toomey	University of California, Davis
C. P. Schott	Pennsylvania State College
W. J. Bleckwenn	University of Wisconsin
Edmund LaFond	Catholic University
J. S. Merriman, Jr.	U. S. Coast Guard Academy
Ralph H. Young	Michigan State College
Chairman: W. J. Bleckwenn	
Guide Editor: C. P. Schott	
Secretary: Edmund LaFond	

3
4

Fencing Rules

Charles R. Schmitter	Michigan State College
Joseph Fiems	U. S. Naval Academy
Alvar Hermanson	University of Chicago
Rene Peroy	Harvard University
Miguel de Capriles	New York University
Chairman: Alvar Hermanson	

Gymnastics Rules

Charles Keeney	University of California
Maximillian W. Younger	Temple University
Ralph A. Piper	University of Minnesota
Erwin F. Beyer	University of Chicago
Robert S. Flieger	Montana State College
Chester W. Phillips	U. S. Naval Academy
Chairman: Erwin F. Beyer	

Ice Hockey Rules

Louis F. Keller	University of Minnesota
J. Murray Murdoch	Yale University
David A. Tirrell	Trinity-Pawling School
E. W. Millett	Colby College
Chedy Thompson	Colorado College
Herbert W. Gallagher	Northeastern University
J. Howard Starr	Colgate University
Chairman Louis Keller	
Guide Editor: David A. Tirrell	
Secretary: David A. Tirrell	

LaCrosse Rules

Thomas J. Dent	Dartmouth College
William Kelso Morrill	John Hopkins University
Glenn N. Thiel	Pennsylvania State College
Morris D. Gilmore	U. S. Naval Academy
Ferris Thomsen	University of Pennsylvania
J. Bruce Munro	Harvard University
Chairman: Morris D. Gilmore	
Guide Editor: Albert A. Brisotti	
Secretary: Glenn A. Thiel	
(Advisory Committee)	

C. de C. Brower	U.S. Intercollegiate LaCrosse Assn.
John E. Faber	U.S. Intercollegiate LaCrosse Assn.
Charles E. Marsters	U.S. Intercollegiate LaCrosse Assn.
John C. Sim	U.S. Intercollegiate LaCrosse Assn.
Bishop F. Baker	U.S. Intercollegiate LaCrosse Assn.
Albert A. Brissotti	U.S. Intercollegiate LaCrosse Assn.

Wrestling Rules

B. R. Patterson	University of Nebraska
J. E. Bullock	Williams College
Glenn C. Law	University of Illinois
Julius F. Wagner	Colorado A. & M. College
E. F. Caraway	Lehigh University
L. L. Mendenhall	Iowa State Teachers College
Art Griffith	Oklahoma A. & M. College
Frank D. Gardner	National High School Federation

Chairman: B. R. Patterson
Guide Editor: B. R. Patterson
Secretary: E. F. Caraway

Baseball Committee

1st	W. L. Gardner	University of Vermont
2nd	E. D. Barnes	Colgate University
3rd	R. A. Smith	Washington and Lee University
4th	John H. Kobs	Michigan State College
5th	A. J. Lewandowski	University of Nebraska
6th	Lloyd Messersmith	Southern Methodist University
7th	Fritz Brennecke	Colorado School of Mines
8th	Clinton W. Evans	University of California

Chairman: E. D. Barnes

TOURNAMENT COMMITTEES

Basketball Tournament

Arthur C. Lonborg	Northwestern University
George R. Edwards	University of Missouri
Reaves E. Peters	Missouri Valley Intercollegiate A. A.
Everett S. Dean	Stanford University
Asa S. Bushnell	Eastern College Athletic Conference

Chairman: Arthur C. Lonborg

Selection Committees

First District

Ray Oosting (Chairman)	Trinity College
William H. McCarter	Dartmouth College
John W. Bunn	Springfield College

Second District

William H. Anderson (Chairman)	Lafayette College
Franklin C. Cappon	Princeton University
John J. Gallagher	Niagara University

Third District

Gus K. Tebell (Chairman)
Adolph Rupp
Edmund M. Cameron

University of Virginia
University of Kentucky
Duke University

Fourth District

Douglas R. Mills (Chairman)
W. S. Chandler
David E. Reese

University of Illinois
Marquette University
Mid-American Conference

Fifth District

Bruce Drake (Chairman)
A. E. Eilers
Clyde E. McBride

University of Oklahoma
Missouri Valley Conference
Kansas City (Mo.) Star

Sixth District

Jack Gray (Chairman)
J. F. McKale
Madison Bell

University of Texas
University of Arizona
Southern Methodist University

Seventh District

L. C. Butler (Chairman)	Colorado State College of Education
Vadal Peterson	University of Utah
Ellison E. Ketchum	Denver University

Eighth District

Justin M. Barry (Chairman)	Univ. of Southern California
Jack Friel	Washington State College
Dennis A. Heenan	Univ. of Santa Clara

Golf Tournament

Ted B. Payseur	Northwestern University
Ellis P. Hagler	Duke University
Robert H. Kepler	Ohio State University
Charles E. Finger	Stanford University
Joseph M. Sullivan	Yale University
John Dear	University of New Mexico

Chairman: Ted B. Payseur

Tennis Tournament

William C. Ackerman	Univ. of California at Los Angeles
Paul Bennett	Northwestern University
Charles S. Garland	Baltimore, Maryland
Norman B. Bramall	Haverford College

Emmett J. Pare
D. A. Penick
Chairman: William C. Ackerman

Tulane University
University of Texas

MISCELLANEOUS COMMITTEES

Eligibility

E. LeRoy Mercer
O. K. Cornwell
Victor O. Schmidt
Chairman: E. LeRoy Mercer

University of Pennsylvania
University of North Carolina
Pacific Coast Intercollegiate A. C.

Preservation of Records

J. Kyle Anderson
University of Chicago

Publications

Ralph Furey
E. LeRoy Mercer
Asa S. Bushnell
Chairman: Ralph Furey

Columbia University
University of Pennsylvania
Eastern College Athletic Conference

Small Colleges

Malcolm E. Morrell
C. E. Bilheimer
Frontis W. Johnston
J. H. Nichols
C. Ward Macy
Francis G. Welch
Howard Olson
Hugh Tiner
Chairman: J. H. Nichols

Bowdoin College
Gettysburg College
Davidson College
Oberlin College
Coe College
Kansas State Tchrs. College of Emporia
Colorado College
George Pepperdine College

ROLL OF MEMBERS

(This listing is based on information available to the Secretary, March 1, 1950. The abbreviations are (P) President; (F) Faculty Representative or Athletic Chairman, (AD) Athletic Director or Graduate Manager of Athletics.)

First District

American International College, Springfield, Mass.: John H. Miller (P), Henry A. Butova (F) and (AD).
Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.: Charles W. Cole (P), A. W. Marsh (F), Lloyd P. Jordan (AD).
Bates College, Lewiston, Me.: Charles F. Phillips (P), Lloyd H. Lux (AD).
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.: Rev. William L. Keleher (P), Rev. Maurice J. Dullea (F), John Curley (AD).
Boston University, Boston, Mass.: Daniel L. Marsh (P), John M. Harmon (F) and (AD).
Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.: Kenneth C. M. Sills (P), Malcolm E. Morrell (F) and (AD).
Brown University, Providence, R.I.: Henry M. Wriston (P), Walter H. Snell (F), Paul F. Mackesey (AD).
Colby College, Waterville, Me.: J. S. Bixler (P), Sherwood Brown (F), G. F. Loeks (AD).
College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.: Rev. John A. O'Brien (P), Rev. J. M. Tiernan (F), Eugene Flynn (AD).
Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H.: John S. Dickey (P), Herbert Hill (F), William H. McCarter (AD).
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.: James B. Conant (P), William J. Bingham (F) and (AD).
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.: James R. Killian (P), Horton G. Stever (F), Ivan J. Geiger (AD).
Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.: Samuel S. Stratton (P), Phelps N. Swett (F), Arthur M. Brown (AD).
Northeastern University, Boston, Mass.: Carl S. Ell (P), Edward S. Parsons (F) and (AD).
Norwich University, Northfield, Vt.: Homer L. Dodge (P), Albert Fraser (F), Lloyd C. Harper (AD).
Providence College, Providence, R.I.: Rev. Robert J. Slavin (P), Rev. A. B. Begley (F) and (AD).
Rhode Island State College, Kingston, R.I.: Carl R. Woodward (P) and (F), Frank W. Keaney (AD).
Springfield College, Springfield, Mass.: Paul M. Limbert (P), Archie P. Allen (F), John W. Bunn (AD).
Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.: George K. Funston (P), Arthur H. Hughes (F), Ray Oosting (AD).
Tufts College, Medford, Mass.: Leonard Carmichael (P), Edward MacNaughton (F), W. Stanton Yeager (AD).
United States Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn.: Rear Admiral W. N. Derby, Superintendent; Captain S. E. Swicegood (F), Commander John S. Merriman, Jr. (AD).
University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.: A. N. Jorgensen (P), Wendell H. Kinsey (F), J. O. Christian (AD).
University of Maine, Orono, Me.: Arthur A. Hauck (P), Clifford Patch (F), Elton E. Wieman (AD).
University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.: Ralph A. Van Meter (P), Charles F. Oliver (F), Warren P. McGuirk (AD).

University of New Hampshire, Durham, N.H.: Arthur S. Adams (P), Gilbert B. Gould (F), Carl Lundholm (AD).
University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.: W. S. Carlson (P), F. D. Carpenter, (F), W. L. Gardner (AD).
Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.: Victor L. Butterfield (P), J. Frederick Martin (F), and (AD).
Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.: James P. Baxter III (P), John C. Jay (F) and (AD).
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, Mass.: Rear Admiral Wat Tyler Culverius (P), Percy R. Carpenter (F) and (AD).
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.: Charles Seymour (P), Robert A. Hall (F) and (AD).
30

Second District

Alfred University, Alfred, N.Y.: M. Ellis Drake (P), S. R. Scholes, Jr. (F), James A. McLane (AD).
Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.: L. T. Benezet (P), H. S. Rhinesmith (F), H. Paul Way (AD).
Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N.Y.: Harry D. Gideonse (P), Arnold Broggi (F), Al Baggett (AD).
Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N.Y.: Harry S. Rogers (P), H. Q. Middendorf (F), Arthur H. Meinhold (AD).
Canisius College, Buffalo, N.Y.: Rev. R. Schouten (P), James H. Crowdle (F), Rev. T. J. Dineen (AD).
Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam, N.Y.: Jesse H. Davis (P), William J. Farrisee (F), Henry R. Hodge (AD).
Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y.: Everett N. Case (P), William A. Reid (AD).
College of the City of New York, New York, N.Y.: Harry N. Wright (P), F. S. Lloyd (F), Sam Winograd (AD).
Colleges of the Seneca (Hobart), Geneva, N.Y.: Alan W. Brown (P), Francis L. Kraus (F) and (AD).
Columbia University, New York, N.Y.: Dwight D. Eisenhower (P), Nicholas M. McKnight (F), Ralph Furey (AD).
Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornelius de Kiewiet (P), H. C. Stephenson (F), Robert J. Kane (AD).
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa.: Rev. Francis P. Smith (P), Rev. S. J. Federici (F), W. John Davis (AD).
Fordham University, New York, N.Y.: Rev. Laurence J. McGinley (P), Rev. Lawrence A. Walsh (F), John F. Coffey (AD).
Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.: Theodore A. Distler (P), J. Shober Barr (F) and (AD).
Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.: Rev. Hunter Guthrie (P), Rev. Edward Jacklin (F), Jack L. Haggerty (AD).
Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa.: Henry W. A. Hanson (P), C. E. Bilheimer (AD).
Hamilton College, Clinton, N.Y.: Robert W. McEwen (P), Mox A. Weber (AD).
Hartwick College, Oneonta, N.Y.: Henry J. Arnold (P), Wallace R. Klinger (F), Harold Bradley (AD).
Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.: Gilbert F. White (P), Roy E. Randall (F) and (AD).
Hofstra College, Hempstead, N.Y.: John C. Adams (P), E. Trudeau Thomas (F).
Ithaca College, Ithaca, N.Y.: Leonard B. Job (P), L. S. Hill (F), Ben A. Light (AD).
Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.: Ralph C. Hutchison (P), Lawrence Conover (F), William H. Anderson (AD).

LaSalle College, Philadelphia, Pa.: Brother G. Paul (P), James J. Henry (AD).
Lehigh University, South Bethlehem, Pa.: Martin D. Whitaker (P), P. L. Sadler (F) and (AD).
Lock Haven Teachers College, Lock Haven, Pa.: Richard T. Parsons (P), W. Howard Vost (AD).
Manhattan College, New York, N.Y.: Brother B. Thomas (P), Brother D. Joseph (F), Kenneth A. Norton (AD).
Moravian College, Bethlehem, Pa.: Raymond S. Haupert (P), R. D. Hassler (F), Harvey T. Gillespie (AD).
Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.: Levering Tyson (P), John V. Shankweiler (F), George E. Lawson (AD).
New York University, New York, N.Y.: Harry W. Chase (P), John F. Sullivan (F), John E. Miller (AD).
Niagara University, Niagara Falls, N.Y.: Rev. Francis L. Meade (P), Rev. Vince R. Young (F), John J. Gallagher (AD).
Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa.: Col. F. K. Hyatt (P), Col. Clarence Starr (F), Col. J. Elwood Ludwig (AD).
Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.: James Milholland (P), P. L. Bentley (F), Carl P. Schott (AD).
Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.: Harold W. Dodds (P), F. R. B. Godolphin (F), R. Kenneth Fairman (AD).
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y.: Livingston W. Houston (P), H. Oakley Sharp (F), Roland Brown (AD).
Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.: Robert C. Clothier (P), Cornelius B. Boocock (F), George E. Little (AD).
St. John's University, Brooklyn, N.Y.: Rev. J. A. Flynn (P), Rev. Joseph W. Browne (F), W. T. McLaughlin (AD).
St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, Pa.: Rev. John J. Long (P), Rev. Francis J. Bradley (F), George A. Bartelsman (AD).
St. Lawrence University, Canton, N.Y.: Eugene G. Bewkes (P), Charles M. Rebert (F), Ronald T. Burkman (AD).
Seton Hall College, South Orange, N.J.: Msgr. John McNulty (P), Victor J. DiFilippo (F), Rev. James A. Carey (AD).
Siena College, Loudonville, N.Y.: Rev. Mark Kennedy (P), Rev. Benedict J. Dudley (F), Rev. Maurus E. Fitzgerald (AD).
State Teachers College, Cortland, N.Y.: Donnal V. Smith (P), Ross L. Allen (F), D. C. Moffett (AD).
State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pa.: Harry Kriner (P), Charles R. Eurich (F) and (AD).
State Teachers College, West Chester, Pa.: Charles S. Swope (P), William R. Benner (F) and (AD).
Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N.J.: Harvey N. Davis (P), John C. Sim (F) and (AD).
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.: John W. Nason (P), Willis J. Stetson (F) and (AD).
Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.: William P. Tolley (P), F. G. Crawford (F), Lewis P. Andreas (AD).
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.: Robert L. Johnson (P), M. E. Gladfelter (F), Earl R. Yeomans (AD).
Union College, Schenectady, N.Y.: Carter Davidson (P), J. Harold Wittner (AD).
U. S. Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N.Y.: Rear Admiral Gordon McLentock (P), Captain William H. Randall (F), Commander J. W. Liebertz (AD).
U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.: Maj. General Bryant E. Moore, Superintendent; Lt. Colonel O. C. Krueger (F), Colonel Earl H. Blaik (AD).

U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Rear Admiral J. L. Holloway, Superintendent; Captain R. B. Pirie (F), Captain H. H. Caldwell (AD).
University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y.: Samuel P. Capen, Chancellor; R. E. Shaffer (F), James E. Peelle (AD).
University of Delaware, Newark, Del.: William S. Carlson (P), Charles Lanier (F), William D. Murray (AD).
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.: Harold Stassen (P), E. LeRoy Mercer (F), H. Jamison Swarts (AD).
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.: R. H. Fitzgerald (P), Norman Ochsenhirt (F), T. J. Hamilton (AD).
University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, P.R.: Jaime Benitez (P), Enrique Vilella (F), Eugenio Guerra (AD).
University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.: Alan Valentine (P), Frank P. Smith (F), Louis A. Alexander (AD).
Villanova College, Philadelphia, Pa.: Rev. Francis X. N. McGuire (P), Rev. Joseph M. Dougherty (F), William M. Connelly (AD).
Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, Pa.: Paul R. Stewart (P), James H. Miller (F), J. Stanton Keck (AD).
Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa.: John Orr (P), Grover C. Washabaugh (F) and (AD).
West Virginia University, Morgantown, W.Va.: Irvin Stewart (P), G. O. Romney (F), Roy M. Hawley (AD).

Third District

Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.: Ralph B. Draughon (P), Roger W. Allen (F), Wilbur Hutsell (AD).
American University, Washington, D.C.: Paul F. Douglass (P), Harold Davis (F), Stafford H. Cassell (AD).
Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.: Rev. Patrick J. McCormick (P), Rev. John M. Walsh (F), Edmund R. LaFond (AD).
Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson College, S.C.: Robert F. Poole (P), L. W. Milford (F), Frank Howard (AD).
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.: John E. Pomfret (P), Nelson Marshall (F), Reuben N. McCray (AD).
Davidson College, Davidson, N.C.: John R. Cunningham (P), J. F. Pinkney (F), Paul Scott (AD).
Duke University, Durham, N.C.: H. Hollis Edens (P), Charles A. Jordan (F), E. M. Cameron (AD).
Emory University, Atlanta, Ga.: Goodrich C. White (P), J. G. Stipe (F), Thomas McDonough (AD).
Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.: D. S. Campbell (P), Don A. Veller (F), Howard G. Danford (AD).
Furman University, Greenville, S.C.: John L. Plyler (P), H. R. Dobson (F), James G. Meade (AD).
George Washington University, Washington, D.C.: Cloyd H. Marvin (P), B. H. Jarman (F), C. M. Farrington (AD).
Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.: Blake R. Van Leer (P), Lloyd W. Chapin (F), William A. Alexander (AD).
Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.: Alonzo G. Moron (P), Charles H. Williams (F) and (AD).
Howard University, Washington, D.C.: Mordecai W. Johnson (P), St. Clair Price (F), Edward L. Jackson (AD).
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.: D. W. Bronk (P), William F. Logan (F), Marshall S. Turner (AD).

Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.: Harold Stoke (P), J. G. Lee, Jr. (F), T. P. Heard (AD).
Mississippi College, Clinton, Miss.: D. M. Nelson (P), A. E. Wood (F), Stanley L. Robinson (AD).
Mississippi State College, State College, Miss.: Fred T. Mitchell (P), R. C. Weems (F), C. R. Noble (AD).
North Carolina State College, Raleigh, N.C.: John W. Harrelson (P), H. A. Fisher (F), Roy Clogston (AD).
Presbyterian College, Clinton, S.C.: Marshall W. Brown (P), F. P. Thompson (F), Walter A. Johnson (AD).
Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.: Paul A. Wagner (P), W. C. Stone (F), Jack McDowell (AD).
Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, La.: Joel Lafayette Fletcher (P), Charles D. Doran (F) and (AD).
Tulane University, New Orleans, La.: Rufus C. Harris (P), F. U. Lake (F), Horace Renegar (AD).
Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Ala.: F. D. Patterson (P), G. W. A. Johnston (F), Cleve L. Abbott (AD).
University of Alabama, University, Ala.: John Gallalée (P), A. B. Moore (F), Jeff Coleman (AD).
University of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md.: T. H. Wilson (P), Harold Gottshall (F), Francis M. Skaff (AD).
University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.: J. Hillis Miller (P), Walter J. Matherly (F), George R. Woodruff (AD).
University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.: J. C. Rogers (P), Alfred W. Scott (F), Wallace Butts (AD).
University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.: H. L. Donovan (P), A. D. Kirwan (F), Bernie A. Shively (AD).
University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.: John W. Taylor (P), Morton Walker (F), John Heldman, Jr. (AD).
University of Maryland, College Park, Md.: H. C. Byrd (P), G. F. Eppley (F), James M. Tatum (AD).
University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.: B. F. Ashe (P), Russell A. Rasco (F), John J. Harding (AD).
University of Mississippi, University, Miss.: John D. Williams, Chancellor, T. A. Bickerstaff (F), C. M. Smith (AD).
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.: Gordon Gray (P), A. W. Hobbs (F), R. A. Fetzer (AD).
University of Richmond, Richmond, Va.: G. M. Modlin (P), R. C. McDanel (F), Malcolm Pitt (AD).
University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.: Norman M. Smith (P), J. F. Penney (F), Rex Enright (AD).
University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.: Boylston Green (P), G. S. Bruton (F), Gordon M. Clark (AD).
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.: C. E. Brehm (P), N. W. Dougherty (F), Robert R. Neyland (AD).
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.: Colgate W. Darden (P), Norton Pritchett (F) and (AD).
Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.: B. Harvie Branscomb (P), Fred Lewis (F), William M. Edwards (AD).
Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va.: Maj. General R. J. Marshall, Superintendent, Colonel Oliver Bucher (F), Colonel Frank L. Summers (AD).
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.: Walter S. Newman (P), C. P. Miles (F), W. L. Younger (AD).
Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, N.C.: Thurman Kitchin (P), F. W. Clonts (F), J. H. Weaver (AD).
Washington College, Chestertown, Md.: Fred C. Livingood (P), Harry S. Russell (F), Edward L. Athey (AD).

Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.: Francis P. Gaines (P), Clayton E. Williams (F), R. A. Smith (AD).
Western Kentucky State Teachers College, Bowling Green, Ky.: Paul L. Garrett (P), B. T. Smith (F), V. Ted Hornback (AD).
Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md.: Lowell S. Ensor (P), Forrest L. Free (F), Charles W. Havens (AD).
Xavier University, New Orleans, La.: Mother M. Agatha (P), Robert S. Shea (F), Alfred C. Priestley (AD).

Fourth District

Albion College, Albion, Mich.: W. W. Whitehouse (P), William Gilbert (F), D. R. Sprankle (AD).
Ashland College, Ashland, O.: Glenn Clayton (P), Maurice Newkirk (F), George Donges (AD).
Baldwin Wallace College, Berea, O.: John L. Knight (P), H. T. Ficken (F), Ray Watts (AD).
Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.: Carey Croneis (P), P. W. Boutwell (F), Dolph Stanley (AD).
Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, O.: F. J. Prout (P), Ralph G. Harshman (F), Harold Anderson (AD).
Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.: M. O. Ross (P), W. L. Howard (F), Paul D. Hinkle (AD).
Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis.: Nelson V. Russell (P), Roy Weir (F), Charles M. Heyer (AD).
Case Institute, Cleveland, O.: T. Keith Glennan (P), G. A. Carroll (F), Ray A. Ride (AD).
Central Michigan College of Education, Mt. Pleasant, Mich.: Charles L. Anspach (P), Joseph P. Carey (F), D. P. Rose (AD).
College of Wooster, Wooster, O.: Howard F. Lowry (P), Karl Ver Steeg (F), E. M. Hole (AD).
Denison University, Granville, O.: Kenneth I. Brown (P), Edson C. Rupp (F), Walter J. Livingston (AD).
DePaul University, Chicago, Ill.: Very Rev. Comerford J. O'Malley (P), Rev. Joseph G. Phoenix (F), Raymond J. Meyer (AD).
DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind.: Clyde E. Wildman (P), W. C. Middleton (F), Raymond R. Neal (AD).
Fenn College, Cleveland, O.: Edward Hodnett (P), John W. McNeill (F), Homer E. Woodling (AD).
Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.: Henry Towley Heald (P), C. P. Deakins (F), Bernard Weissman (AD).
Illinois State Normal University, Normal, Okla.: R. W. Fairchild (P), H. J. Ivens (F), Howard J. Hancock (AD).
Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.: Herman B. Wells (P), W. R. Breneman (F), Paul J. Harrell (AD).
John Carroll University, Cleveland, O.: Rev. Frederick W. Welfle (P), Rev. G. Krupitzer (F), Eugene G. Oberst (AD).
Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich.: J. S. Everton (P), Allen B. Stowe (F) and (AD).
Kent State University, Kent, O.: George A. Bowman (P), Sellow Roberts (F), Trevor Rees (AD).
Kenyon College, Gambier, O.: Gordon K. Chalmers (P), Stuart R. McGowan (F), H. F. Pasini (AD).
Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.: Nathan M. Pusey (P), Arthur C. Denney (F) and (AD).
Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.: Rev. Edward J. O'Donnell (P), Rev. Thomas F. Divine (F), Conrad M. Jennings (AD).
Miami University, Oxford, O.: Ernest H. Hahne (P), W. H. Shideler (F), James A. Gordon (AD).

Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Houghton, Mich.: Grover C. Dillman (P), William Longacre (F), Alan J. Bovard (AD).
Michigan State College, E. Lansing, Mich.: John A. Hannah (P), Lloyd C. Emmons (F), Ralph H. Young (AD).
Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich.: Eugene B. Elliott (P), Wallace A. Cole (F), E. J. Ryneerson (AD).
Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill.: James H. Grier (P), Hugh Beveridge (F), Robert C. Woll (AD).
Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.: J. R. Miller (P), F. George Seulberger (F), Ted B. Payseur (AD).
Oberlin College, Oberlin, O.: William E. Stevenson (P), J. H. Nichols (F) and (AD).
Ohio State University, Columbus, O.: H. L. Bevis (P), Wendell D. Postle (F), Richard C. Larkins (AD).
Ohio University, Athens, O.: John C. Baker (P), Milt Thomas (F), Carroll Widdoes (AD).
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O.: Arthur S. Flemming (P), Allen Conger (F), George Gauthier (AD).
Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.: Frederick L. Hovde (P), V. C. Freeman (F), Guy J. Mackey (AD).
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill.: D. W. Morris (P), William J. Tudor (F), Glenn Martin (AD).
State Teachers College, Superior, Wis.: Jim Dan Hill (P), Herbert M. Weeks (F), Leo DiMarco (AD).
State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.: Virgil M. Hancher (P), Paul J. Blommers (F), Paul W. Brechler (AD).
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.: E. C. Colwell (P), Robert M. Strozier (F), T. Nelson Metcalf (AD).
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.: Raymond Walters (P), Norman Auburn (F), M. Charles Mileham (AD).
University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.: George D. Stoddard (P), Robert B. Browne (F), Douglas R. Mills (AD).
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.: Alexander G. Ruthven (P), R. W. Aigler (F), H. O. Crisler (AD).
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.: J. L. Morrill (P), Henry Rottschaefer (F), Frank G. McCormick (AD).
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.: Rev. John J. Cavanaugh (P), Rev. T. M. Hesburgh (F), Edward Krause (AD).
University of Toledo, Toledo, O.: Wilbur W. White (P), Charles R. King (F), A. G. Francis (AD).
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.: E. B. Fred (P), Kenneth Little (F), Harry Stuhldreher (AD).
Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.: O. P. Kretzmann (P), Dana B. Schwanholt (F), Karl H. Henrichs (AD).
Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.: Frank H. Sparks (P), Myron Phillips (F), Glen Harmeson (AD).
Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.: David D. Henry (P), W. A. Harbison (F), A. W. Thompson (AD).
Western Illinois State Teachers College, Macomb, Ill.: Frank A. Beau (P), Dempsey Reid (F), R. W. Hanson (AD).
Western Michigan College, Kalamazoo, Mich.: Paul V. Sangren (P), John C. Hoekje (F), M. J. Gary (AD).
Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.: John S. Millis (P), Earl L. Shoup (F), William M. Councill (AD).
Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill.: V. R. Edman (P), Arthur Volle (F), E. A. Coray (AD).
Wilberforce State College, Wilberforce, O.: Charles H. Wesley (P), Mack M. Greene (F) and (AD).
Youngstown College, Youngstown, O.: H. W. Jones (P), Clarence E. Gould (F), Willard L. Webster (AD).

Fifth District

Bradley University, Peoria, Ill.: David B. Owens (P), Philip Becker, Jr. (F), Arthur Bergstrom (AD).
Central State College, Edmond, Okla.: W. Max Chambers (P), Cliff Otto (F), Dale E. Hamilton (AD).
Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Ia.: Byron S. Hollinshead (P), C. Ward Macy (F), Dick Clausen (AD).
Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia.: Russell D. Cole (P), Mark E. Hutchinson (F), Paul K. Scott (AD).
Creighton University, Omaha, Neb.: William H. McCabe (P), David A. Shyne (F), J. V. Belford (AD).
Drake University, Des Moines, Ia.: Henry G. Harmon (P), Frank Gardner (F), J. Russell Cook (AD).
Grinnell College, Grinnell, Ia.: Samuel N. Stevens (P), Joseph W. Charlton (F), Henry A. Brown (AD).
Iowa State College, Ames, Ia.: Charles E. Friley (P), H. D. Bergman (F), Louis E. Menze (AD).
Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Ia.: Malcolm Price (P) H. Earl Rath (F), L. L. Mendenhall (AD).
Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kan.: M. S. Eisenhower (P), H. H. Haymaker (F), Thurlo McCrady (AD).
Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Mo.: Sherman Scruggs (P), W. A. Hamilton (F), Raymond H. Kemp (AD).
Nebraska State Teachers College, Wayne, Neb.: Victor P. Morey (P), Fred Dale (F), Don B. Emery (AD).
Oklahoma A. & M., Stillwater, Okla.: Henry Garland Bennett (P), Clarence H. McElroy (F), Henry P. Iba (AD).
St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Ia.: Rt. Rev. A. J. Burke (P), Rev. J. O. McAuliffe (F), Larry Mullins (AD).
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.: Rev. Paul C. Reinert (P), Rev. Thomas J. Stemper (F), William Durney (AD).
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.: Robert L. Stearns (P), Warren O. Thompson (F), Harry G. Carlson (AD).
University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.: Rev. Celestin Steiner (P), Fr. Ed O'Connor (F), Lloyd Brazil (AD).
University of Dubuque, Dubuque, Ia.: Rev. Rollo La Part (P), W. B. Zooker (F), Kenneth E. Mercer (AD).
University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.: Dean W. Malott (P), T. DeWitt Carr (F), E. C. Quigley (AD).
University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.: Frederick A. Middlebush (P), Sam B. Shirky (F), Don Faurot (AD).
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.: R. G. Gustavson (P), Earl Fullbrook (F), George R. Clark (AD).
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N.D.: John C. West (P), L. C. Harrington (F), Glenn L. Jarrett (AD).
University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.: G. L. Cross (P), Walter W. Kraft (F), C. B. Wilkinson (AD).
University of Omaha, Omaha, Neb.: P. Milo Bail (P), Frank H. Gorman (F), Virgil Yelkin (AD).
University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Okla.: C. I. Pontius (P), George Small (F), W. E. Morris, Jr. (AD).
University of Wichita, Wichita, Kan.: Harry F. Corbin (P), Lloyd McKinley (F), James W. Trimble (AD).
Wartburg College, Waverly, Ia.: Conrad H. Becker (P), Elmer Hertel (F), M. C. Nelson (AD).
Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.: Arthur H. Compton (P), Charles Belknap (F), Blair Gullion (AD).

Sixth District

Arizona State College, Flagstaff, Ariz.: Lacey A. Eastburn (P), Francis C. Osborne (F), Earl F. Insley (AD).

Arizona State College, Tempe, Ariz.: Grady Gammage (P), D. R. VanPetten (F), Donn Kinzle (AD).
Baylor University, Waco, Tex.: W. R. White (P), J. D. Bragg (F), George Sauer (AD).
Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Tex.: Rupert N. Richardson (P), R. A. Collins (F), Warren B. Woodson (AD).
Midwestern University, Wichita Falls, Tex.: James B. Boren (P), D. L. Ligon (F), Billy Stamps (AD).
New Mexico A. & M. College, State College, N.M.: John W. Branson (P), G. R. Hamiel (F), C. S. Moll (AD).
North Texas State College, Denton, Tex.: W. J. McConnell (P), W. G. Woods (F), Theron J. Fouts (AD).
Philander Smith College, Little Rock, Ark.: M. Lafayette Harris (P), J. D. Scott (F) and (AD).
Rice Institute, Houston, Tex.: W. V. Houston (P), Hubert E. Bray (F), Jess C. Neely (AD).
Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex.: Umphrey Lee (P), Edwin D. Mouzon (F), Madison Bell (AD).
Texas A. & M. College, College Station, Tex.: F. C. Bolton (P), D. W. Williams (F), Barlow Irvin (AD).
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.: M. E. Sadler (P), H. B. Hardt (F), Howard Grubbs (AD).
Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Tex.: D. M. Wiggins (P), J. William Davis (F), Morley Jennings (AD).
Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.: W. H. Elkins (P), J. E. Knapp (F), Jack C. Curtice (AD).
Trinity University, San Antonio, Tex.: Monroe G. Everett (P), E. C. Smith (F), W. N. James (AD).
University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.: J. Byron McCormick (P), Floyd E. Thomas (F), J. F. McKale (AD).
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.: L. W. Jones (P), Delbert Swartz (F), John Barnhill (AD).
University of Houston, Houston, Texas.: E. E. Oberholtzer (P), Frank Stovall (F), Harry Fouke (AD).
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N.M.: Tom Popejoy (P), Martin Fleck (F), Berl Huffman (AD).
University of Texas, Austin, Tex.: Theophilus S. Painter (P), V. T. Schuhardt (F), Dana X. Bible (AD).
West Texas State College, Canyon, Tex.: James P. Cornette (P), W. Mitchell Jones (F), W. A. Miller (AD).

U

Seventh District

Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah: Christian Jensen (P), Ariel S. Balif (F), Edwin R. Kimball (AD).
Colorado A. & M. College, Fort Collins, Colo.: William E. Morgan (P), Andrew G. Clark (F), Harry W. Hughes (AD).
Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.: William H. Gill (P), Howard M. Olson (F), Juan Reid (AD).
Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colo.: John W. Vanderwilt (P), M. I. Signer (F), Fritz S. Brennecke (AD).
Colorado State College of Education, Greeley, Colo.: William R. Ross (P), A. L. Troxel (F), John Hancock (AD).
Idaho State College, Pocatello, Idaho: Carl W. McIntosh (P), Thomas P. West (F), John M. Vesser (AD).
Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont.: R. R. Renne (P), P. C. Gaines (F), Schubert R. Dyche (AD).
University of Denver, Denver, Colo.: Alfred C. Jacobs (P), Louis F. Breternitz (F), Ellison Ketchum (AD).
University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah: A. Ray Olpin (P), Leland

H. Creer (F), Ike J. Armstrong (AD).
 University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.: G. D. Humphrey (P), A. L. Keenly (F), Glenn J. Jacoby (AD).
 Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah: Franklin S. Harris (P), King Hendricks (F), Joe E. Whiteside (AD).
 Western State College of Colorado, Gunnison, Colo.: Peter Paul Mickelson (P), George L. Nuckolls (F), Paul W. Wright (AD).

Eighth District

California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo, Calif.: Julian A. McPhee (P), Vernon Meacham (F), Robert Mott (AD).
 College of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif.: Robert Burns (P), Edward Betz (F), Earl R. Jackson (AD).
 Fresno State College, Fresno, Calif.: Arnold E. Joyal (P), Eugene A. Egan (F), Loren W. Tuttle (AD).
 George Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, Calif.: Hugh M. Tiner (P), Wade Ruby (F), A. O. Duer (AD).
 Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.: Rev. Francis E. Corkery (P), Rev. Francis Herrington (F), Archie P. Sherar (AD).
 Loyola University, Los Angeles, Calif.: Rev. C. S. Casassa (P), Rev. John F. Connolly (F), Bernard M. Hopkins (AD).
 Montana State University, Missoula, Mont.: James A. McCain (P), J. E. Miller (F), Clyde Hubbard (AD).
 Oregon State College, Corvallis, Ore.: A. L. Strand (P), C. V. Ruzek (F), Roy S. Keene (AD).
 San Diego State College, San Diego, Calif.: Walter R. Hepner (P), William L. Terry (F), Charles R. Smith (AD).
 San Jose State College, San Jose, Calif.: T. W. MacQuarrie (P), Wilbur V. Hubbard (F) and (AD).
 Santa Barbara College, Santa Barbara, Calif.: J. Howard Williams (P), W. F. Aggeler (F), Theodore Harder (AD).
 Stanford University, Stanford University, Calif.: Wallace Sterling (P), Lawrence A. Kimpton (F), Alfred R. Masters (AD).
 State College of Washington, Pullman, Wash.: Wilson Compton (P), T. H. Kennedy (F), Robert Brumblay (AD).
 University of California, Berkeley, Calif.: Robert G. Sproul (P), Stanley B. Freeborn (F), Brutus Hamilton (AD).
 University of California, Davis, Calif.: K. A. Ryerson, Supt., L. D. Leach (F), I. F. Toomey (AD).
 University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.: Clarence Dykstra, Provost, David Bjork (F), Wilbur C. Johns (AD).
 University of Hawaii, Honolulu, T.H., Gregg M. Sinclair (P), Charles A. Moore (F), Thomas K. Kaulukukui (AD).
 University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho: J. E. Buchanan (P), T. S. Kerr (F), George Greene (AD).
 University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.: Harry K. Newborn (P), Orlando John Hollis (F), Leo A. Harris (AD).
 University of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.: Rev. William J. Dunne (P), Rev. Charles L. Harney (F), Rev. James R. Duffy (AD).
 University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara, Calif.: Rev. William C. Gainera (P), Rev. W. H. Crowley (F), Rev. William Tobin (AD).
 University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.: Fred D. Fagg, Jr. (P), Hugh C. Willett (F), Willis O. Hunter (AD).
 University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.: Raymond B. Allen (P), H. P. Everest (F), C. H. Cassill (AD).
 Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash.: Chester C. Maxey (P), Charles J. Armstrong (F), Leo C. Humphrey (AD).

ALLIED MEMBERS

(P—President; S—Secretary; C—Commissioner)

BORDER INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—G. R. Hamiel, New Mexico A. & M. College, State College
 S—C. Z. Lesher, Univ. of Arizona, Tucson
 C—Emil L. Larson, Univ. of Arizona, Tucson

Mailing Address: Emil L. Larson
 University of Arizona
 Tucson, Arizona

Arizona State Col., Flagstaff
 Arizona State Col., Tempe
 Univ. of Arizona, Tucson
 Hardin-Simmons, Abeline, Tex.
 Univ. of New Mexico, Albuquerque

New Mexico A. & M., State College
 Texas Tech Col., Lubbock
 Texas Western Col., El Paso
 West Texas State Col., Canyon

CENTRAL COLLEGIATE CONFERENCE

P—Alex Wilson, Loyola Univ.
 S—Stanley Lowe, Marquette Univ.

Bradley Univ., Peoria, Ill.
 Butler Univ., Indianapolis
 DePaul Univ., Chicago
 Univ. of Detroit, Detroit
 Drake Univ., Des Moines
 Loyola Univ., Chicago

Mailing Address: Stanley Lowe
 1533 W. Wisconsin Avenue
 Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin

Marquette Univ., Milwaukee
 Michigan Normal Col., Ypsilanti
 Michigan State Col., E. Lansing
 Notre Dame, South Bend
 Wayne Univ., Detroit
 Western Mich. Col., Kalamazoo

CENTRAL INTER-COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—W. J. Poundstone, Southwestern College
 S—R. G. Cremer, Kansas State Teachers

Mailing Address: R. G. Cremer
 Kansas State Teachers Col.
 Emporia, Kansas

Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays
 Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia
 Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg
 Rockhurst Col., Kansas City, Mo.

St. Benedict's Col., Atchison, Kansas
 Southwestern College, Winfield Kansas
 Washburn Municipal U., Topeka, Kansas

COLLEGE CONFERENCE OF ILLINOIS

P—L. C. Brissman, Augustana Col.
 S—C. L. Miller, James Millikin Univ.

Augustana Col., Rock Island
 Carthage Col., Carthage
 Elmhurst Col., Elmhurst
 Illinois Col., Jacksonville
 Illinois Wesleyan Univ., Bloomington

Mailing Address: C. L. Miller
 James Millikin University
 Decatur, Illinois

James Millikin Univ., Decatur
 Lake Forest Col., Lake Forest
 North Central Col., Naperville
 Wheaton Col., Wheaton

COLORED INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

P—Paul J. Moore, W. Va. State

College

S—G. G. Singleton, Va. State

College

Bluefield State Col., Bluefield, Va.
Delaware State Col., Dover
Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.
Howard Univ., Washington, D.C.
Johnson C. Smith Univ.,
Charlotte, N.C.
Lincoln Univ., Lincoln, Pa.
Morgan State Col., Baltimore, Md.
N. C. Agri. & Tech. College
Greensboro
North Carolina Col., Durham

Mailing Address: G. G. Singleton
Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia

St. Augustine's Col., Raleigh,
N. C.
St. Paul's Polytechnic Ins.,
Lawrenceville, Va.
Shaw Univ., Raleigh, N. C.
Virginia State Col., Petersburg
Virginia Union Univ.,
Richmond
W. Va. State Col., Institute
Winston-Salem Teachers Col.,
Winston-Salem

St. Michael's Col., Winooski
Park, Vt.
Univ. of Scranton, Scranton, Pa.
Seton Hall Col., South Orange,
N.J.

Siena Col., Loudonville, N.Y.
Springfield Col., Springfield, Mass.
Swarthmore Col., Swarthmore, Pa.
Syracuse Univ., Syracuse, N. Y.
Temple Univ., Philadelphia
Trinity Col., Hartford, Conn.
Tufts Col., Medford, Mass.
Union Col., Schenectady, N.Y.
U.S. Coast Guard Academy,
New London, Conn.

U.S. Military Academy,
West Point, N.Y.
U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis,
Md.
Upsala Col., E. Orange, N. J.
Ursinus Col., Collegeville, Pa.
Villanova Col., Villanova, Pa.
Wagner Col., Staten Island, N.Y.
Wesleyan Univ., Middletown, Conn.
W. Chester State Teachers Col.,
West Chester, Pa.
Western Maryland Col.,
Westminster
W. Va. Univ., Morgantown
Williams Col., Williamstown, Mass.
Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn.

EASTERN COLLEGE ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—Robert J. Kane, Cornell

S—Asa S. Bushnell

Albright College, Reading, Pa.
Alfred Univ., Alfred, N. Y.
Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Boston College, Newton, Mass.
Boston Univ., Boston, Mass.
Brooklyn Poly. Ins., Brooklyn
Brooklyn Col., Brooklyn
Brown Univ., Providence, R.I.
Bucknell Univ., Lewisburg, Pa.
Buffalo Univ., Buffalo, N. Y.
Canisius Col., Buffalo, N. Y.
City College of New York
Clarkson Col., Potsdam, N. Y.
Colby College, Waterville, Me.
Colgate Univ., Hamilton, N. Y.
Columbia Univ., New York City
Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N. Y.
Cortland State Teachers College,
Cortland, N. Y.
Dartmouth Col., Hanover, N. H.
Univ. of Delaware, Newark
Dickinson Col., Carlisle, Pa.
Drexel Ins., Philadelphia, Pa.
Duquesne Univ., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Fordham Univ., New York City
Franklin & Marshall, Lancaster,
Pa.
Georgetown Univ., Washington,
D. C.
Gettysburg Col., Gettysburg, Pa.
Hamilton Col., Clinton, N. Y.
Hartwick Col., Oneonta, N. Y.
Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.
Haverford Col., Haverford, Pa.
Hobart Col., Geneva, N. Y.

Mailing Address: A. S. Bushnell
Biltmore Hotel
New York 17, New York

Hofstra Col., Hempstead, N. Y.
Holy Cross Col., Worcester, Mass.
Ithaca Col., Ithaca, N. Y.
Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore,
Md.
Juniata Col., Huntingdon, Pa.
Lafayette Col., Easton, Pa.
LaSalle Col., Philadelphia
Lebanon Valley Col., Annville, Pa.
Lehigh Univ., Bethlehem, Pa.
Manhattan Col., New York City
Mass. Ins. of Tech., Cambridge
Moravian Col., Bethlehem, Pa.
Muhlenberg Col., Allentown, Pa.
Newark Colleges, Newark, N. J.
New York Univ., New York City
Niagara Univ., Niagara Falls,
N. Y.
Northeastern Univ., Boston, Mass.
Penn. Military Col., Chester, Pa.
Univ. of Pa., Philadelphia
Penn. State Col., State College
Princeton Univ., Princeton, N. J.
Providence Col., Providence, R. I.
Queens Col., Flushing, N.Y.
Renssalaer Poly., Troy, N.Y.
Rhode Island St., Kingston
Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick,
N.J.
St. Bonaventure Col., St.
Bonaventure, N.Y.

St. John's Univ., Brooklyn
St. Joseph's Col., Philadelphia
St. Lawrence Univ., Canton, N.Y.

GULF COAST INTERCOLLEGIATE CONFERENCE

P—D. L. Ligon, Midwestern Univ.
S—G. W. Mahan, Trinity Univ.

Univ. of Houston, Houston
Midwestern Univ., Wichita
Falls, Texas

North Texas State Col.,
Denton
Trinity Univ., San Antonio,
Texas

KANSAS COLLEGE ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—J. F. Fries, McPherson Col.
S—Orville P. Loper, Kans.
Wesleyan

Baker Univ., Baldwin
Bethany Col., Lindsborg
Bethel College, North Newton
Col. of Emporia, Emporia

Mailing Address: Orville P. Loper
Kansas Wesleyan, Univ.
Salina, Kansas

Kansas Wesleyan Univ., Salina
McPherson Col., McPherson
Ottawa Univ., Ottawa

LONE STAR CONFERENCE

P—L. I. Smith, E. Texas State
Teachers College
S—J. Roy Wells, Sam Houston
State Teachers College

E. Texas State Teachers College,
Commerce
Sam Houston State Teachers Col.,
Huntsville

Mailing Address: J. Roy Wells
Sam Houston State Teachers,
Huntsville, Texas

Stephen F. Austin State Tchrs.
Col., Nacogdoches
Southwest Texas State Teachers
College, San Marcos
Sul Ross State Teachers, Alpine

MID AMERICAN ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—Ralph Bursiek, Cincinnati
S—William Council, Western
Reserve
C—David E. Reese, Dayton, Ohio

Mailing Address: D. E. Reese
408 Lowe Building
Dayton, Ohio

Butler Univ., Indianapolis
Univ. of Cincinnati, Cincinnati
Miami Univ., Oxford, Ohio
Ohio Univ., Athens

Western Mich. Col.,
Kalamazoo
Western Reserve Univ.,
Cleveland, O.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—Charles Havens, Western Maryland
S—E. LeRoy Mercer, Univ. of Pennsylvania

Albright College, Reading, Pa.
Bucknell Univ., Lewisburg, Pa.
Columbia Univ., New York City
Univ. of Delaware, Newark, Del.
Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.
Drexel Ins., Philadelphia
Elizabethtown College,
Elizabethtown, Pa.
Franklin & Marshall College,
Lancaster, Pa.
Gettysburg Col., Gettysburg, Pa.
Haverford Col., Haverford, Pa.
Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore
Juniata Col., Huntingdon, Pa.
Lafayette Col., Easton, Pa.
LaSalle Col., Philadelphia
Lebanon Valley Col., Annville, Pa.
Lehigh Univ., Bethlehem, Pa.
Moravian Col., Bethlehem, Pa.
Muhlenberg Col., Allentown, Pa.
New York Univ., New York
Penn. Military Col., Chester
Princeton Univ., Princeton, N.J.

Mailing Address: E. LeRoy Mercer
Weightman Hall, Univ. of Penn.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick,
N.J.
St. Joseph's Philadelphia
Seton Hall Col., S. Orange, N.J.
Stevens Ins. of Tech., Hoboken,
N.J.
Susquehanna Univ., Selins-
grove, Pa.
Swarthmore Col., Swarthmore,
Pa.
Temple Univ., Philadelphia
Univ. of Penn., Philadelphia
Univ. of Scranton, Scranton,
Pa.
Ursinus Col., Collegeville, Pa.
Wagner Col., Staten Island,
N.Y.
Washington College, Chester-
town, Md.
W. Chester State Teachers Col.,
West Chester, Pa.
Western Maryland College,
Westminster

MIDWEST COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—J. F. Andrews, Ripon
S—C. Ward Macy, Coe College
C—C. Ward Macy, Coe College

Beloit Col., Beloit, Wis.
Carleton Col., Northfield, Minn.
Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Ia.
Cornell Col., Mt. Vernon, Ia.
Grinnell Col., Grinnell, Ia.

Mailing Address: C. W. Macy
Coe College
Cedar Rapids, Iowa

Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.
Lawrence Col., Appleton, Wis.
Monmouth Col., Monmouth, Ill.
Ripon Col., Ripon, Wis.

MINNESOTA STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE CONFERENCE

P—G. H. Lynch, St. Cloud
S—W. E. Boots, Winona Teachers

Mailing Address: W. E. Boots
State Teachers College
Winona, Minnesota

Bemidji State Teachers College,
Bemidji
Mankato State Teachers College,
Mankato
Moorhead State Teachers Col.,
Moorhead

St. Cloud State Teachers Col.,
St. Cloud
Winona State Teachers Col.,
Winona

MISSOURI VALLEY CONFERENCE

P—Rev. T. J. Stemper,
St. Louis Univ.
C—A. E. Eilers, St. Louis, Mo.

Bradley Univ., Peoria, Ill.
Univ. of Detroit, Detroit
Drake Univ., Des Moines, Iowa
Oklahoma A. & M. Col., Stillwater

MISSOURI VALLEY INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSN.

P—Sam B. Shirky, Missouri
S—Earl S. Fullbrook, Nebraska
C—Reaves E. Peters, Kansas
City, Mo.

Iowa State Col., Ames
Kansas State Col., Manhattan
Univ. of Colorado, Boulder

Mailing Address: Reaves Peters
Hotel Muehlebach
Kansas City 6, Missouri

Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence
Univ. of Missouri, Columbia
Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln
Univ. of Oklahoma, Norman

MOUNTAIN STATES CONFERENCE

P—Louis Breternitz, Univ of
Denver
S—King Hendricks, Utah State
C—E. L. Romney

Brigham Young Univ., Provo
Colorado A. & M., Ft. Collins
Denver University, Denver

Mailing Address: E. L. Romney
Hotel Utah
Salt Lake City

Utah State Agri. College, Logan
Univ. of Utah, Salt Lake City
Univ. of Wyoming, Laramie

OHIO ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—S. R. McGowan, Kenyon
S—George Daniel, Lorain, O.
C—George Daniel, Lorain, O.

Univ. of Akron, Akron
Capital College, Columbus
Denison Univ., Granville
Heidelberg Col., Tiffin
Kent State Col., Kent
Kenyon College, Gambier
Marietta College, Marietta

Mailing Address: George Daniel
2534 E. Erie Avenue
Lorain, Ohio

Mount Union Col., Alliance
Muskingum Col., New Concord
Oberlin Col., Oberlin
Ohio State Columbus
Ohio Wesleyan Univ., Delaware
Otterbein Col., Westerville
Wittenberg Col., Wittenberg
College of Wooster, Wooster

PACIFIC COAST INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—H. P. Everest, Washington
S—T. H. Kennedy, Washington
State
C—Victor O. Schmidt

Univ. of California, Berkeley
Univ. of California at L.A.
University of Idaho, Moscow
Montana State Univ., Missoula
Univ. of Oregon, Eugene

Mailing Address: V. O. Schmidt
General Petroleum Bldg.
Los Angeles (14), Calif.

Oregon State College, Corvallis
Univ. of S. Cal., Los Angeles
Stanford University, Palo Alto
Univ. of Washington, Seattle
State College of Washington,
Pullman

PACIFIC NORTHWEST INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—Charles W. Howard,
Lewis and Clark
S—L. G. Sparks, Willamette
University

Lewis & Clark Col., Portland,
Ore.
Linfield Col., McMinnville, Oregon
Pacific Univ., Forest Grove, Ore.

Mailing Address: L. G. Sparks
Willamette University
Salem, Ore.

Whitman Col., Walla Walla,
Wash.
Willamette Univ., Salem, Ore.
College of Idaho, Caldwell

ROCKY MOUNTAIN FACULTY ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—O. L. Troxel, Colo. State
College of Education
S—M. I. Signer, Colorado
School of Mines

Colorado Col., Colorado Springs
Colorado School of Mines, Golden
Colorado State Col. of Ed., Greeley

Mailing Address: M. I. Signer
Colorado School of Mines
Golden, Colorado

Idaho State College, Pocatello
Montana State College, Bozeman
Western State College, Gunnison
Colo.

SOUTHEASTERN CONFERENCE

P—Fred T. Mitchell, Mississippi
State
S—N. W. Dougherty, Univ. of
Tennessee
C—Bernie Moore, Birmingham,
Alabama

Univ. of Alabama, University
Alabama Poly. Inst., Auburn
Univ. of Florida, Gainesville
Univ. of Georgia, Athens
Georgia Institute of Tech., Atlanta
Univ. of Kentucky, Lexington
Louisiana State, Baton Rouge

Mailing Address: Bernie Moore
Redmont, Hotel
Birmingham, Alabama

Univ. of Mississippi, University
Mississippi State College, State
College
Univ. of Tennessee, Knoxville
Tulane Univ., New Orleans
Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville,
Tenn.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—C. G. Jaeger, Pomona College
S—H. A. Kirkpatrick, Occidental

California Inst. of Tech.,
Pasadena
Occidental Col., Los Angeles

Mailing Address: H. A. Kirk-
patrick
Occidental College
Los Angeles 41, California

Pomona College, Claremont
Univ. of Redlands, Redlands
Whittier College, Whittier

SOUTHERN CONFERENCE

P—G. F. Eppley, Maryland
S—D. S. McAlister, The Citadel

Clemson Col., Clemson Col., S.C.
Col. of William & Mary,
Williamsburg, Va.
Davidson Col., Davidson, N.C.
Duke Univ., Durham, N.C.
Furman Univ., Greenville, S.C.
North Carolina State, Raleigh
The Citadel, Charleston, S.C.
George Washington Univ.,
Washington, D.C.
Univ. of Maryland, College Park

Mailing Address: D. S.
McAlister
The Citadel
Charleston, S.C.

Univ. of N. Carolina, Chapel
Hill
Univ. of Richmond, Richmond,
Va.
Univ. of S. Carolina, Columbia
Va. Military Inst., Lexington
Va. Poly. Institute, Blacksburg
Wake Forest, Wake Forest, N.C.
Washington & Lee Univ.,
Lexington, Va.
West Virginia, Morgantown

SOUTHERN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—St. Elmo Brady, Fisk Univ.
S—R. S. Darnaby, Tuskegee
C—B. T. Harvey, Morehouse

Allen Univ., Columbia, S.C.
Alabama A. & M. Inst., Normal
Benedict Col., Columbia, S.C.
Clark Col., Atlanta, Ga.
Fisk Univ., Nashville, Tenn.
Florida A. & M., Tallahassee
Ft. Valley State., Ft. Valley, Ga.
Knoxville College, Knoxville

Mailing Address: R. S.
Darnaby
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee, Alabama

Lane College, Jackson, Tenn.
LeMoyne Col., Memphis
Morehouse Col., Atlanta, Ga.
Morris Brown Col., Atlanta, Ga.
State College, Orangeburg, S.C.
State Teachers College,
Montgomery
Tuskegee Ins., Tuskegee, Ala.
Xavier University, New Orleans

SOUTHWEST ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—D. W. Williams, Texas A. & M.
S—J. H. Stewart, Dallas, Tex.

Univ. of Arkansas, Fayetteville
Baylor University, Waco, Tex.
Rice Institute, Houston, Tex.
Southern Methodist Univ.,
Dallas, Tex.

Mailing Address: James H.
Stewart
1343 National City Bldg.
Dallas (1), Texas

Texas A. & M. Col., College
Station
Texas Christian Univ., Fort
Worth
University of Texas, Austin

SOUTHWESTERN ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—S. E. Lassiter, Bishop College
S—G. L. Smith, Prairie View

Arkansas State Col., Pine Bluff
Bishop College, Marshall, Texas
Langston Univ., Langston, Okla.
Prairie View A. & M., Prairie
View, Texas
Samuel Huston Col., Austin,
Texas

Mailing Address: G. L. Smith
Prairie View, A. & M. College
Prairie View, Texas

Southern University,
Scotlandville, La.
Texas College, Tyler
Texas State Univ. for Negroes,
Houston
Wiley College, Marshall, Texas

TEXAS COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

P—George L. Landolt, Austin
College
S—W. B. McDaniel, McMurry
College

Abilene Christian Col., Abilene
Austin College, Sherman
Howard Payne Col., Brownwood
McMurry College, Abilene

Mailing Address: W. B.
McDaniel
McMurry College
Abilene, Texas

Southwestern Univ., George-
town
Texas College of A. & T.,
Ringsville

WESTERN (INTERCOLLEGIATE) CONFERENCE

P—W. R. Breneman, Indiana
S—Kenneth Little, Wisconsin
C—K. L. Wilson, Chicago, Ill.

Indiana University, Bloomington
Michigan State, E. Lansing
Northwestern Univ., Evanston
Ohio State Univ., Columbus
Purdue Univ., Lafayette, Ind.

Mailing Address: K. L. Wilson
Sherman Hotel
Chicago 1, Illinois

State Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City
Univ. of Illinois, Champaign
Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis
Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Andover Academy, Andover, Massachusetts
Detroit Institute of Technology, Detroit, Michigan
University School, Shaker Heights, Ohio

AFFILIATED MEMBERS

American Football Coaches Association
American Association of College Baseball Coaches
College Swimming Coaches Association
National Association of Basketball Coaches of the United States
National Association of Collegiate Commissioners
National Collegiate Track Coaches Association
National Intercollegiate Boxing Coaches Association
National Intercollegiate Hockey Coaches Association

LIST OF ACCREDITED DELEGATES AND VISITORS IN ATTENDANCE AT THE FORTY-FOURTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

I. MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

Akron, University of: Kenneth Cochrane
Alabama Polytechnic Institute: Wilbur H. Hutsell, Ralph B. Draughon
Alabama, University of: A. B. Moore, Jefferson J. Coleman
Albion College: Dale R. Sprankle
Albright College: E. L. Shirk
Alfred University: James A. McLane, Alex J. Yunevich
Allegheny College: H. P. Way
American International College: Joseph J. O'Grady, Henry Butova
Amherst College: A. W. Marsh, L. P. Jordan
Arizona State College (Tempe): C. E. Southern, Donn Kinzle, Ed
Doherty, George C. Yates
Arizona, University of: J. F. McKale, Charles S. Tribble
Arkansas, University of: Delbert Swartz, J. H. Barnhill
Austin College: Ray Morrison
Ashland College: George H. Donges
Bates College: Lloyd W. Lux, Robert W. Hatch
Baylor University: J. D. Bragg
Boston College: John P. Curley, John J. Drummond, Rev. M. V. Dullea,
Frank G. Bowden, William Sullivan
Boston University: John M. Harmon, Victor Stout
Bowdoin College: Malcolm E. Morrell, Adam Walsh
Bowling Green State University: Ralph H. Harshman
Bradley University: Philip Becker, Jr., Arthur J. Bergstrom
Brigham Young University: Edwin R. Kimball
Brooklyn College: Al Baggett
Brown University: Robert W. Kenny, Paul F. Mackesey
Bucknell University: A. C. Humphreys
Buffalo, University of: James E. Peele
California, University of (Berkeley): Brutus Hamilton, Lynn Wald-
orf, Stanley B. Freeborn, Clinton W. Evans
California, University of (Davis): I. F. Toomey
California, University of (Los Angeles): David K. Bjork, Wilbur
Johns
Canisius College: James H. Crowle
Case Institute of Technology: George A. Carroll, Ray A. Ride
Catholic University: E. R. LaFond
Chicago, University of: J. Kyle Anderson, T. N. Metcalf
Cincinnati, University of: M. C. Mileham, Bill Schwarberg
Citadel, The: J. Quinn Decker, D. S. McAlister
City College of New York: Sam Winograd
Clarkson College: A. Barr Snively, Jr.
Clemson College: Frank Howard, C. R. Williams
Colby College: Robert J. Keefe
Colgate University: Everett D. Barnes
College of Pacific: Robert Monagan
Colorado A. & M. College: Andrew G. Clark, Harry W. Hughes
Colorado College: Howard M. Olson, K. G. Freyschlag
Colorado, University of: Frank Potts
Columbia University: Ralph Furey, Dean M. McKnight, Robert E.
McBride
Connecticut, University of: George Van Bibber, W. H. Kinsey, J. C.
Christian

Cornell University: Robert J. Kane, James Lynah
Cortland State Teachers College: Donovan C. Moffett
Dartmouth College: William H. McCarter
Davidson College: James F. Pinkney, Charles Jamerson, Crowell Little
Delaware, University of: Charles N. Lanier, Jr., William D. Murray
Denison University: Walter J. Livingston
Denver, University of: Albert C. Jacobs, Ellison K. Ketchum
DePauw University: Edwin R. Snavely
Detroit, University of: Rev. E. J. O'Connor, Lloyd Brazil
Drake University: Russell Cook
Drexel Institute: L. P. Mains
Duke University: Charles E. Jordan, E. M. Cameron, Wallace Wade
Duquesne University: Jack Davis
Emory University: Thomas E. McDonough
Florida State University: Howard G. Danford
Florida, University of: J. Hillis Miller, Walter J. Matherly, D. K. Stanley
Fordham University: Rev. Laurence A. Walsh, Rev. Kevin O'Brien, John F. Coffey
Franklin and Marshall College: J. Shober Barr, Boyd L. Sponaugle, Thomas J. Floyd
Furman University: H. R. Dobson
George Pepperdine College: Al Duer
George Washington University: C. Max Farrington, B. H. Jarman
Georgetown University: Rev. Edward G. Jacklin, Rev. Cornelius Herlihy, Jack Hagerty, Rev. J. F. Cohalan
Georgia Institute of Technology: William A. Alexander, Lloyd W. Chapin
Georgia, University of: Alfred W. Scott
Gettysburg College: C. E. Bilheimer
Hamilton College: Mox A. Weber
Hampton Institute: C. H. Williams, H. R. Jefferson
Harvard University: William J. Bingham, Arthur L. Valpey, Forrest R. Jordan, W. Henry Johnston
Haverford College: Roy E. Randall
Hawaii, University of: Thomas Kaulukukui
Hobart College: F. L. Kraus
Hofstra College: John B. MacDonald
Holy Cross, College of the: Eugene F. Flynn
Houston, University of: Harry H. Fouke, Clyde V. Lee
Illinois, University of: Douglas R. Mills, Charles E. Flynn
Indiana University: Paul J. Harrell, Owen L. Cochrane
Iowa State College: L. E. Menze
Iowa, University of: Paul J. Blommers, Paul W. Brechler, K. E. Leib
John Carroll University: Eugene G. Oberst
Johns Hopkins University: Marshall S. Turner, Jr., Howard Myers, Jr.
Kansas State College: Thurlo McCrady
Kansas, University of: T. DeWitt Carr, E. C. Quigley, Jules Sikes
Kent State University: Trevor Rees
Kentucky, University of: Bernie Shively, Paul Bryant, A. D. Kirwan
Kenyon College: H. F. Pasini
Lafayette College: William H. Anderson, Arthur Winters
Lake Forest College: John W. Breen
LaSalle College: James J. Henry
Lehigh University: P. L. Sadler, William Leckonby, Paul E. Short, M. D. Whitaker
Louisiana State University: J. G. Lee, Jr., T. P. Heard, J. S. Slack, J. L. Malone
Louisville, University of: Morton Walker, Bovard Clayton, Frank Camp

Loyola University of Los Angeles: Jordan Olivar
Maine, University of: E. E. Wieman, David M. Nelson, Milo R. Lude
Manhattan College: Kenneth A. Norton, George T. Eastment
Marquette University: C. M. Jennings, Rev. Thomas F. Divine
Maryland, University of: H. C. Byrd, James Tatum, Bill Meek
Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Ivan J. Geiger
Massachusetts, University of: Warren P. McGuirk, Sidney W. Kauffman
Miami, University of: Jack Harding, Foster E. Alter
Miami University (Ohio): James A. Gordon, George L. Rider, Woodrow Wills, Warren H. P. Schmakel
Michigan State College: Lloyd C. Emmons, Ralph H. Young, C. L. Munn, John H. Kobs
Michigan, University of: H. O. Crisler, Ralph W. Aigler
Middlebury College: Arthur M. Brown, Walter J. Nelson
Minnesota, University of: Frank G. McCormick, Henry Rottschaefer
Mississippi College: S. L. Robinson
Mississippi State College: C. R. Noble, R. C. Weems
Mississippi, University of: T. A. Bickerstaff, C. M. Smith
Missouri, University of: Sam B. Shirky, Don Faurot
Montana State College: Schubert R. Dyche
Moravian College: Larry Rosati
Muhlenberg College: Levering Tyson, Gurney F. Afflerbach, George E. Lawson
Nebraska, University of: George Clark, Earl Fullbrook, B. R. Patterson
New Hampshire, University of: Carl Lundholm
New Mexico A. and M. College: C. S. Moll
New Mexico, University of: Roy W. Johnson
New York University: John F. Sullivan, George Yanosik, William M. Maiden
North Carolina State College: H. A. Fisher, Roy Clogston
North Carolina, University of: R. A. Fetzer, O. K. Cornwell, C. P. Erickson, A. W. Hobbs, D. D. Carroll
North Texas State College: Odus Mitchell
Northeastern University: Edward S. Parsons
Northwestern University: George Seulberger, Ted B. Payseur
Norwich University: Lloyd C. Harper
Notre Dame, University of: Rev. T. M. Hesburgh, Edward Krause, Rev. John Murphy, Herbert E. Jones
Oberlin College: John H. Nichols
Ohio University: Carroll Widdoes, Howard L. Brinker
Ohio State University: Wendell D. Postle, Richard C. Larkins, Richard W. Fisher, W. E. Snapp
Ohio Wesleyan University: George Gauthier, Glenn Fraser
Oklahoma A. & M. College: R. O. Whitenton, C. H. McElroy
Oklahoma, University of: Walter W. Kraft, C. B. Wilkinson
Omaha, University of: Virgil Yelkin
Oregon State College: C. V. Ruzek, R. S. Keene
Oregon, University of: Leo A. Harris
Pennsylvania Military College: Clarence T. Starr, Wesley C. Smith
Pennsylvania State College: F. L. Bentley, H. R. Gilbert, F. J. Bedenk
Pennsylvania, University of: H. Jamison Swarts, E. LeRoy Mercer, F. W. Luehring, Albert R. Morcom
Pittsburgh, University of: V. W. Lanfear, T. J. Hamilton, Frank Carter
Princeton University: F. R. B. Godolphin, R. Kenneth Fairman
Providence College: Rev. A. B. Begley
Purdue University: V. C. Freeman, Guy J. Mackey
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Roland K. Brown

Rhode Island State College: Fred D. Tootell, Frank Keaney
Rice Institute: Jess C. Neely, G. L. Hermance, Joe W. Davis
Richmond, University of: R. C. McDanel
Rutgers University: George E. Little, Harry J. Rockafeller, Harvey
Harman
St. John's University: Rev. Joseph W. Browne, W. J. McLaughlin
St. Joseph's College: George A. Bertelsman
St. Louis University: Rev. Thomas J. Stemper, Bill Durney
San Francisco, University of: Joseph L. Kuharich
Santa Barbara College: Stanley B. Freeborn
Santa Clara, University of: Dennis A. Heenan
Scranton, University of: J. J. Coniff, Douglas Holcomb, Peter Carl
isimo
Seton Hall College: Rev. James A. Carey, John A. Gibson, Eugene
Collins
Shippensburg State Teachers College: Vinton H. Rambo
Siena College: Leo Callahan
South, University of the: Gordon M. Clark
South Carolina, University of: Rex Enright, James T. Penney, Hank
Bartows
Southern California, University of: H. C. Willett, W. O. Hunter
Southern Methodist University: Edwin Mouzon, Jr., John Lee Brooks,
Madison Bell, Lloyd Messersmith, Lester Jordan
Stanford University: Alfred R. Masters
Swarthmore College: Willis J. Stetson
Syracuse University: Lewis P. Andreas, James Decker, Floyd
Schwartzwalder
Tennessee, University of: N. W. Dougherty, R. R. Neyland, Ralph E.
Dunford
Temple University: E. R. Yeomans, William L. Hughes, Albert Kawal,
A. B. Knapp
Texas A. & M. College: D. W. Williams, Barlow Irvin, Harry Stiteler
Texas Christian University: Howard Grubbs, Henry B. Hardt
Texas Tech College: J. O. Morgan
Texas, University of: V. T. Schuhardt, D. X. Bible
Texas Western College: E. J. Knapp, Jack C. Curtice
Toledo University: A. G. Francis
Trinity College: Ray Oosting, Arthur H. Hughes
Tufts College: C. P. Houston
Tulane University: Horace Renegar, F. U. Lake, Andy Rogers
Tulsa, University of: George D. Small
Tuskegee Institute: Cleve L. Abbott, R. S. Darnaby
U. S. Coast Guard Academy: John S. Merriman
U. S. Merchant Marine Academy: J. W. Liebertz, James Camarata
U. S. Military Academy: E. H. Blaik, O. C. Krueger
U. S. Naval Academy: H. H. Caldwell, Rip Miller
Union College: John J. McLaughry
Upsala College: John H. McNally
Utah State Agricultural College: King Hendricks
Utah, University of: Leo G. Provost, Ike J. Armstrong
Valparaiso University: Karl H. Henrichs
Vanderbilt University: Fred J. Lewis
Vermont, University of: Archie T. Post, John C. Evans
Villanova College: Rev. Edward B. McKee, William Connelly
Virginia Military Institute: William Couper, Frank L. Summers
Virginia Polytechnic Institute: Walter S. Newman, C. P. Miles, W.
L. Younger, R. C. McNeish
Virginia, University of: Colgate W. Darden, Norton Pritchett, Segar
Gravatt, R. N. Hoskins
Wabash College: Glen W. Harmeson

Wake Forest College: Forrest W. Clonts, James H. Weaver, Worth
Copeland
Washington, State College of: T. H. Kennedy, Robt. C. Brumblay
Washington, University of: H. P. Everest, Harvey Cassill
Washington and Lee University: R. A. Smith, Jim Anderson
Wayne University: Alden W. Thompson
Wesleyan University: J. F. Martin
West Chester State Teachers College: W. Glenn Killinger
West Virginia University: G. Ott Romney, William G. Thompson, H.
M. Fridley, Roy M. Hawley, D. S. De Groot
Western Illinois State College: Raymond W. Hanson
Western Kentucky State College: Ted Hornback
Western Maryland College: Charles W. Havens
Western Michigan College: John W. Gill, Charles H. Maher, M. J.
Gary, Homer M. Dunham
Western Reserve University: William M. Councill
Westminster College: Will W. Orr
Wheaton College: H. C. Chrouser
Wichita, University of: Jim Trimble, Lloyd McKinley
Wilberforce State College: Mack M. Greene
William and Mary, College of: Nelson Marshall, R. N. McCray
Williams College: John C. Jay, J. E. Bullock
Wisconsin, University of: Harry Stuhldreher, Kenneth Little
Wittenberg College: John B. Van Why
Wooster College of: John M. Swigart
Worcester Polytechnic Institute: P. R. Carpenter
Wyoming, University of: Glenn J. Jacoby
Xavier University: Alfred C. Priestley
Yale University: William E. Perkins, Richard C. Carroll, Edward D.
O'Donnell
Youngstown College: Willard L. Webster

II. ALLIED AND AFFILIATED MEMBERS

Border Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: G. R. Hamiel, Emil L.
Larson
Central Collegiate Conference: Stanley Lowe
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: F. G. Welch
Colored Intercollegiate Athletic Association: G. G. Singleton
Eastern College Athletic Conference: Asa S. Bushnell, George L.
Shiebler
Kansas College Athletic Conference: E. J. Cragoe
Mid-American Athletic Conference: Dave Reese
Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: Charles W.
Havens
Missouri Valley Conference: A. E. Eilers
Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Reaves E. Peters
Mountain States Conference: Louis A. Breternitz, E. L. Romney
National Association of Collegiate Commissioners: Reaves E. Peters
Ohio Athletic Conference: J. H. Nichols
Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Victor O. Schmidt
Pacific Northwest Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Chester R.
Stackhouse
Southeastern Conference: Bernie Moore
Southern Conference: Geary Eppley
Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: B. T. Harvey
Southwest Athletic Conference: James H. Stewart
Southwestern Athletic Conference: A. W. Mumford
Western (Intercollegiate) Conference: W. R. Breneman

III. NON-MEMBERS AND INDIVIDUALS

Judson Bailey, Columbia Broadcasting System
Hugh Beville, National Broadcasting Company
H. Brandschain, Broadcasting Magazine
John J. Cerny, Adelphi College
Dick Cresap, Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin
Allison Danzig, New York Times
Jimmy Dolan, National Broadcasting Company
Charles Einstein, International News Service
L. M. Elliott, Newark (N.J.) Evening News
Benny Friedman, Brandeis University
Hugh Fullerton, Jr., Associated Press
Will Grimsley, Associated Press
Harry Harris, Associated Press
Dick Herbert, Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer
Bill Keefe, New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune
Leonard Koppett, New York Herald-Tribune
Barney Kremenco, New York Journal-American
Charles Law, Suffolk University
Larry Leonard, Richmond (Va.) News Leader
Jos. McConnell, National Broadcasting Company
Stuart B. McIlver, Baltimore (Md.) Sun
Stan Opotowsky, United Press
William R. Paddock, Sporting News
Lyman S. Perry, Associated Colleges of Upper New York
Luther F. Poling, Marshall College
Bill Reed, Washington, D.C.
Joseph Reichler, Associated Press
Charley Reilly, Easton (Pa.) Express
Lawrence Robinson, New York World Telegram
Harold Rosenthal, New York Herald Tribune
Pat Robinson, International News Service
Fred Russell, Nashville (Tenn.) Banner
Joseph M. Sheehan, New York Times
Judson Sherrill, Don Spencer Company
Steve Snider, United Press
Don Spencer, Don Spencer Company
Charles E. Thorp, Football Publications
Lincoln A. Werden, New York Times

1949 YEARBOOK

SECTION II

REPORTS OF DISTRICTS

FIRST DISTRICT

LLOYD P. JORDAN, AMHERST COLLEGE

WITH nearly all colleges in the First District members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference and working in close harmony in carrying out their own high standards as well as giving cooperation to the National Collegiate Athletic Association, intercollegiate athletics have enjoyed a good year.

The spirit and enthusiasm of the young men competing as well as those participating as spectators have indicated a healthy atmosphere.

It is noted that the colleges of the District are making a sincere effort to comply with eligibility regulations. Of recent interest is the matter of summer baseball — "Competition on any team where payment of players is in effect" is to be interpreted literally.

Increased expenses are becoming more of a burden and paring of the budget will, no doubt, be in effect at many institutions. This will increase the trend toward student organizations playing on an informal basis, sympathetically received by athletic departments but without financial aid from the departments.

While enthusiasm has been great on the part of the participants, there was a noticeable decrease in spectator participation with the exception of outstanding contests between annual rivals. The smaller institutions were not affected as much as the larger ones.

The District must be alert and continue to study the problem of television and the effect it will have on the athletic programs. Channeling of contests from other sections have been received with enthusiasm and there is the possibility, if continued, that they will reduce the attendance and interest of the local picture, especially where the teams are not quite championship calibre.

This past fall Dartmouth, under the able direction of Tuss McLaughry, had a great football season while Brown, guided by Rip Engle, produced an excellent team. Trinity replaced Wesleyan as a small college power. Williams won the Little Three crown. Bowdoin and Colby tied for the championship in the Maine series. Maine and Connecticut tied in the Yan-

kee Conference. Springfield, Boston College and Boston University had good seasons.

Interest in other sports will continue to keep pace throughout the year.

SECOND DISTRICT

ROBERT J. KANE, CORNELL UNIVERSITY

AS was done last year the Athletic Directors from the schools in District 2 were asked to report in sequence on certain current problems so this summation will follow a numerical pattern. The replies to most of the questions were so strikingly similar it was a simple matter to arrive at an abbreviated answer covering the general trend. Any deviation from the consensus will be pointed out.

(1) It is clear that there was no real change in the amount of athletic activity carried on by most schools during the past year over the previous one. The year 1948 marked a second post-war year of stability insofar as schedule arrangements, staff requirements and sports activity were concerned; and 1949 followed the pattern.

(2) Everywhere it is reported that spirit and enthusiasm are high among the sports participants and the status quo is being maintained in the interest of the non-participating or spectator undergraduates in the sports program.

(3) The N.C.A.A. Sanity Code seems to meet with the approval of all the schools in District 2. Most believe it to be a very good thing for athletics in general and find no particular hardship complying with its regulations. A few expressed difficulty in handling training table restrictions of one meal a day, particularly in football and basketball. Some felt it worked to the disadvantage of the working student; others in large cities expressed the viewpoint that it was an impracticable arrangement because the one meal a day restriction gave too little opportunity to get the squad together.

(4) All schools are finding great difficulty in coping with the ever-rising costs of conducting an intercollegiate athletic program. Very few reported a surplus in 1948 operations. A great many more reported substantial deficits. None, however, reported any serious cutbacks on program. In fact some reported well-defined plans to expand their programs and to increase facilities.

(5) Some of the schools already in process of building are:- Allegheny College, just completed \$350,000 outdoor athletic area and plan to spend another \$350,000 on a field house; St. Lawrence is planning on starting a new artificial ice rink this year; Columbia is in the process of building a

\$625,000 field house which is to be ready for use in the Fall of 1950; a small field house for Physical Education and Intramural was furnished to Alfred University by the State of New York at a cost of \$120,000; Syracuse University is presently building a gym at an estimated cost of \$3,000,000. It has plans to construct a new football stadium (\$1,000,000) and a field house (\$1,500,000) in the near future; Hofstra is building new dressing quarters and new wing on its gym to house wrestling, fencing and exercise rooms at cost excess of \$100,000.

(6) Lacrosse and fencing are being tried out at several schools for the first time. An increase in physical education and intramural activities is being reported from all schools.

A summary of the replies points to the conclusion that it is becoming increasingly difficult to support a full scale athletic program from gate receipts. A surprising trend is noted in the number of schools which no longer depend solely on gate receipts but are supported in part by University general funds. Schools under this plan now far outnumber those dependent solely on receipts which is a reversal of the figures of ten years ago.

Physical Education, or physical recreation, holds a more important place than it ever has. There is evidently greater demand for play space and instruction in games of a carry-over nature. This is in line with the increased interest to participate in intercollegiate athletics which is clearly evident at all schools.

THIRD DISTRICT

BLAKE R. VAN LEER, GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

THE Third District is happy to welcome two new members — Hampton Institute of Hampton, Virginia, and The Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida.

General Summary

Intercollegiate athletics in the Third District has enjoyed another prosperous year with added emphasis and interest in all sports. Football continues to be the major sport, but baseball, basketball, and track are all showing growth in interest and attendance at the various contests. This is especially true of basketball which is at the best level it has ever been in the South. One factor which has held back the development of basketball in the South has been the lack of adequate physical facilities in which to hold contests of this nature which attract crowds of over 10,000. This situation is improved at North Carolina State College and the University of Florida which have completed structures that great-

ly improve the facilities for basketball. Several other schools have planned such facilities but they will probably not be ready before the 1951-52 season.

The year has been characterized by further development of minor sports programs in wrestling, gymnastics, swimming, golf, tennis, and intra-mural activities. This is very encouraging because it is most desirable to increase student participation in as many sports as possible.

Football

The interest in college football continues to remain keen. Several schools increased the seating capacity of their stadia, and attendance in the Third District was up about 15 per cent over 1948. North Carolina won the Southern Conference title and was invited to the Cotton Bowl. Louisiana State University defeated Tulane, the Southeastern Conference champion, and was invited to the Sugar Bowl. Kentucky was invited to the Orange Bowl, and the University of Maryland to the Gator Bowl.

The new recodified edition of the rule book met with general favor. Some of the games seemed to have too much unnecessary roughness which was variously attributed to lax officiating and the change in the rule on the use of arms and hands on defensive play. Something should be done to disqualify players who strike an opponent in the face or neck with the elbows, forearm, hand, or locked hands. There were too many broken jaws and serious injuries.

Basketball

There is more emphasis on and interest in basketball than there has ever been. Kentucky, the perennial basketball champion of the South, won the N.C.A.A. Tournament by defeating Oklahoma A. & M. This is the second time Kentucky has won the national title.

Swimming

The N.C.A.A. swimming championships were held at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, last spring. While most of the honors were carried off by teams from other districts, the entry list from the Third District was the largest in history.

Other Sports

Of all our sports, track seems to have been the hardest hit by the war and its resulting conditions, but it is picking up again. The first annual meet between the Southern and Southeastern Conference champions was held at Georgia Tech in May and was won by the Southeastern Conference.

In recent years college baseball has shown signs of re-

turning to the limelight. Wake Forest was runner-up for the national championship this year.

Tennis, golf, and wrestling continue to attract large groups of spectators.

Intramurals

Most of the colleges in the Third District have definite, well-organized intramural programs which are under the guidance of experts. It would seem to be in the interest of all athletic programs to spend a large portion of the athletic budgets on intramural sports.

Television

This new form of amusement and news dissemination is growing. As far as can be ascertained at this time, Georgia Tech is the only institution in District Three which televises all of its football and basketball games. The Tulane-Georgia Tech football game in 1948 was the first such game to be televised in this region. The Sugar Bowl game of 1948 was televised privately from the field to a New Orleans hotel where the viewers were charged admission. Georgia Tech is now selling its television rights along lines similar to those handling AM and FM radio rights. It is accumulating experience which should be of value to other collegiate institutions in this region. Thus far, television has had no appreciable effect upon either attendance or gate receipts.

N.C.A.A. Sanity Code

Most of the colleges in the Third District are still unhappy about the Sanity Code. Most of them have made a conscientious effort to comply, and most of them have thus far been able to do so chiefly for the following reasons:

The Sanity Code was not retroactive. It applied this year only to freshmen and sophomores. It has been possible to find enough jobs for needy students to take care of these students reasonably within the code, but it is difficult and there is always the temptation to deceive about it.

We have been in a period of relative prosperity. More parents had more money with which to pay all the expenses of their sons going to college. That condition is not likely to prevail. Most of the colleges in this district think that needy students who play football should be permitted tuition, room, board, books, and fees. They do not have time to carry studies, play football, and work for room and board. Several very excellent colleges have found they cannot comply with the N.C.A.A. provisions and have made up their minds to withdraw or ignore it. It would be to the best interests of intercollegiate athletics in this district if a reasonable compromise could be effected which would permit honest, worthy colleges to continue their association with

the N.C.A.A. To many impartial observers it seems very silly to say you can give a needy student one meal a day and he is an amateur, but if you give him three meals a day he becomes a professional. After all, the purpose of all these intercollegiate arrangements is to educate young men, and you can't do a very good job of that if the boy is hungry.

This tends more and more to the philosophy that holds that unless a boy can afford to pay for it he is not entitled to a college education, or if he is, he isn't entitled to play football. This is an untenable position which it is hoped the N.C.A.A. will correct at its annual meeting in New York City in January, 1950.

FOURTH DISTRICT

LLOYD C. EMMONS, MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE

INTEREST in intercollegiate athletics in the Fourth District continues to rise to greater and greater height. The broad program of sports receiving attention confirms this statement. Such sports as hockey, boxing, track, swimming and gymnastics share the patronage formerly devoted primarily to football, basketball and baseball. And the interest in these latter sports has not correspondingly declined.

Many schools in this district find it impossible to accommodate all who apply at the stadium gates and at the basketball arenas. We now have at the University of Michigan a stadium accommodating over 97,000 people and still the demand for seats cannot be met. This condition exists at most of the Western Conference schools and at Notre Dame University and is a great tribute to the quality of contests held in this district.

The membership in this district has been increased by the addition of Wilberforce College, Wilberforce, Ohio, to our ranks. We are currently receiving ballots on the College of St. Thomas at St. Paul, Minnesota.

The Western Conference (Big Nine) all of whose members are in the Fourth District was made the Big Ten again when on May 20, 1949 Michigan State College was voted into membership to take the place vacated some years ago by the University of Chicago.

The Western Conference race for the football championship which was won by Ohio State University, was extremely interesting and unusually close this year. In fact the winner may have been determined by the success of a kick for point after touchdown which was successful only on a second attempt granted on an offside penalty. If the public wants its sports events exciting, what more can it ask?

The operation of the Sanity Code is proceeding satisfactorily in this district. In most schools it has been necessary to make minor modifications of procedure to comply with its terms; but it is generally conceded that every effort is being made to avoid violations. There is some feeling that the terms of the code may place restrictions on athletes because they are athletes. This would be more serious than giving special consideration to them because they are athletes.

Last year I pointed out that the Fourth District had won championships in most of the competitions sponsored by the N.C.A.A. and indicated our intention to retain these laurels and add others. It appears that we were a bit hasty in making such claims since we were able this year to carry off the championships in only two events — swimming won by Ohio State University and cross country won by Michigan State College.

In closing I should like to express satisfaction with the uniformity of procedure in many phases of our athletic programs which is brought about by N.C.A.A. regulations. I should also like to suggest that with the present tendency toward expanding regional competition, it would be advantageous if the several conferences would bring their rules and regulations into greater harmony.

FIFTH DISTRICT

EARLE DAVIS, KANSAS STATE COLLEGE

ATHLETIC participation in the Fifth District during 1949 indicates that some of the best teams in the country in all sports came from this particular section. Attendance generally held its own or increased in both football and basketball. The calibre of athletic material remained on a high level, despite the fact that the veteran representatives of the armed forces were generally coming into their last year of competition and most teams were composed mainly of boys who had never been in uniform.

In football, Oklahoma remained one of the country's best three or four teams by its record, meriting appearances in the Sugar Bowl for two successive New Year games. Missouri also participated in two successive bowl games, and Oklahoma A. & M., Drake, and Wichita were invited to minor bowls at the beginning of 1949. The general level of competition improved in both the Big Seven and the Missouri Valley Conferences, with Drake producing the nation's leading half back in gaining ground.

In basketball, both major conferences in the Fifth District produced teams that ranked at the top in the nation. Oklahoma A. & M., St. Louis, Bradley, Nebraska, Oklahoma,

and Kansas State were able to upset competition from all other conferences on many occasions, and Oklahoma A. & M. won the right to fight Kentucky in the N.C.A.A. championship finals.

In other sports, the good record continued. Oklahoma A. & M. won the N.C.A.A. wrestling championship, and two other colleges from this district, Iowa State Teachers and Cornell College, won second and third in the nation. Wichita University was host to the N.C.A.A. baseball finalists in a successful tournament held in spacious Lawrence Stadium. The Drake and Kansas Relays continued their record for staging two of the nation's most interesting track carnivals.

The fact that certain stadiums are being enlarged and field houses built, with new attendance records being set in all sports, would imply that athletic interest is still on the upgrade. Intramural and freshman programs continue to develop, and most of the interest in good athletics is healthy.

The Fifth District continues to adjust itself to the N.C.A.A. Sanity Code. Perhaps it has developed a philosophy which attempts to encourage good athletic performance without the evils of commercialization, although the money involved from gate receipts and the pressure of enthusiastic alumni complicate the problem here as elsewhere. The members of this district have made available to athletes opportunities for jobs which have usually paid the athlete's way at college. Several universities, notably Missouri, have offered liberal scholarships for students who possess both athletic and scholarly abilities.

The Fifth District comprised twenty-five colleges and universities at the beginning of 1949. The geographical divisions of the N.C.A.A. have become slightly stretched on occasion in order to allow conferences to keep their members within one district. Two major conferences are included in the Fifth District, and Colorado has been moved into this section in order to keep its national interests in accord with the other members of the Big Seven Conference. In like manner, Detroit and Bradley have come into the district. The Missouri Valley Conference has gradually widened its scope from its original sphere, so that — except for Oklahoma A. & M. — it now represents major colleges in metropolitan centers in the middle west (St. Louis, Detroit, Des Moines, Peoria, Tulsa, and Wichita).

During the past year the Fifth District has added three new members, Nebraska State Teachers College at Wayne, Nebraska; the University of North Dakota at Grand Forks, North Dakota; and Wartburg College at Waverly, Iowa.

SIXTH DISTRICT

C. E. SOUTHERN, ARIZONA STATE COLLEGE (TEMPE)

INCREASED interest in the N.C.A.A. in the 6th district is best shown by the fact that five institutions were added to the membership roll this year. This marks a percentage gain of more than 30%. The institutions joining were Philander Smith of Little Rock, Arkansas; Hardin College of Wichita Falls, Texas; Trinity University of San Antonio, Texas; University of Houston, Houston, Texas, and North Texas State of Denton, Texas.

The 1949 Southwest Athletic Conference basketball race ended in a three-way tie among Baylor, Rice and University of Arkansas. In order to determine the representative from District 6 in the N.C.A.A. play-offs, a four-team tournament among Baylor, Rice, Arkansas, and Arizona, winner of the Border Conference, was held at Dallas. By winning this tournament, Arkansas earned the right to represent the district in the Western play-offs. They lost their first game to Oregon State, but defeated Wyoming the second night to end in third place.

Texas A. & M. won the 1949 Southwest track championship. The third annual Southwest-Big Seven track meet was held in Kansas City in June with the Big Seven victorious for the first time. The University of Texas won the 1949 baseball, tennis, golf, swimming, and fencing championships. The cross-country championship went to the team from Texas A. & M.

In football. The Rice Institute, which went undefeated in conference play and lost only one game to L.S.U. during the full season, were declared champions. Rice will play the University of North Carolina in the Cotton Bowl on January 2, 1950.

In the Border Conference, Arizona won its fourth consecutive basketball title. Conference schools increased their intersectional games to 61, of which they won 36. Arizona's participation in the 6th district play-offs is mentioned above: Arizona won from Baylor and lost to Arkansas. Texas Tech participated in the N.A.I.B. Tournament. Eastern and West-Coast trips scheduled by conference schools increased the intersectional aspect of this sport.

In baseball, the conference tournament first played in 1948 was not held because of lack of teams. It now appears that in 1950 at least five schools will be represented in the sport.

Arizona State College at Tempe continued its dominance in track and field in the conference at the meet held in Albuquerque. Four new records were set. Several intersectional contests were scheduled.

In tennis, Arizona won the conference title with Texas Tech rising as a strong contender.

New Mexico snapped Arizona's hold on the golf championship with competition increasing throughout the conference.

Interest in swimming is on the wane with too few institutions represented to name a conference champion. One dual meet was staged at Albuquerque with Arizona winning.

In football, Texas Tech won its 3rd consecutive conference title in one of the closest races the conference has seen.

At least 3 teams will participate in bowl games. Arizona State College at Tempe plays Xavier of Cincinnati in the Salad Bowl in Phoenix, Arizona. Texas Tech meets San Jose State in the Raisin Bowl at Fresno, California, and Texas Western (formerly Texas Mines) plays Georgetown University of Washington, D.C., in the Sun Bowl at El Paso, Texas.

No data concerning the activities of the new member institutions were available, but a broader coverage will be attempted in the next report.

SEVENTH DISTRICT

LEO G. PROVOST, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

THE calendar year 1949 witnessed some leveling off of attendance in athletic contests in the Rocky Mountain region. However, there continued to be high interest in all athletic programs in the institutions of this district. Continued use of air transportation has decreased the difficulties of geographical location of the Rocky Mountain area and has brought about wide-spread athletic relations with other collegiate institutions throughout the nation.

Intersectional competition was enjoyed by many institutions in the district in almost all sport areas. Close competition and keen rivalry in both conferences represented in this district (the Mountain States Conference and the Rocky Mountain Conference — with six schools in each) have made 1949 an outstanding sport year. Championships in the two conferences were well distributed between member schools. Skiing and baseball continued to increase in popularity. The Colorado State College of Education represented the district in the regional play-off against the University of Southern California. The Brigham Young University could not hold its team together after graduation for a District Seven play-off with Colorado State College of Education.

Both conferences of the Seventh District are in complete support of the N.C.A.A. and its "Sanity Code." Member schools are willing and anxious to cooperate with those re-

sponsible for the enforcement of the "Sanity Code." The work of the Constitutional Compliance Committee is considered commendable, efficient, and necessary by member institutions.

The N.C.A.A. Wrestling tournament was held at Fort Collins with the Colorado A. & M. College acting as host. The meet was a highly successful one and according to the many institutions represented the host institution is to be praised for the efficient and hospitable manner in which they conducted the competition.

On March 17, 18, and 19 the N.C.A.A. Ice Hockey Championship Tournament was held at Colorado Springs with Colorado College acting as host. The schools represented in the tournament were Boston College, Dartmouth University, University of Michigan, and Colorado College. The tournament was won by Boston College.

At the Denver meeting, December 8-12, Idaho State sought admission to the Rocky Mountain Conference and was admitted. It is understood that Idaho State will also seek admission to the N.C.A.A.

District Seven has a district organization to deal with local problems and to maintain satisfactory relations with the National Association. However, there is some feeling that the present system of representation at the National Meeting is not too satisfactory because of lack of continuity through a representative not remaining in that position long enough to effectively represent the district.

The members of the Executive Committee of the District are: Vice-President for District Seven, the member next in succession for Vice-President; the Secretary of the two Conferences and one elected member from the District at large. The Vice-President of the District is determined by rotation.

EIGHTH DISTRICT

STANLEY B. FREEBORN, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

INTEREST in intercollegiate athletics was stimulated in the Eighth District during the past year by the staging of three national championship tournaments on the Pacific Coast. The N.C.A.A. basketball finals were held before a capacity crowd of 11,526 in Edmundson Pavilion on the University of Washington campus in Seattle, the gymnastics championships were held successfully at the University of California in Berkeley for the enjoyment of a surprisingly large audience, and the national track and field championships were again held in the Los Angeles Coliseum, site of the 1932 Olympics.

The basketball finals were the first seen by fans on the West Coast, and highlighted the official N.C.A.A. events for the year in the Eighth District.

Member schools on the Pacific Coast enjoyed successful football seasons, both from the standpoint of wins and losses and gate receipts. Attendance figures showed a general increase, except in areas where games were extensively televised. Three football teams from this area were picked to play in post-season intersectional bowl games: California in the Rose Bowl, for the second consecutive year; Santa Clara in the Orange Bowl at Miami; and Stanford in the Pineapple Bowl at Honolulu.

For the first time in several years, squad rosters in the various sports indicated that the ranks of war veterans in intercollegiate athletics are thinning. The majority of schools in this district had fewer veterans than younger men participating.

This district, like all others, is faced with the problem of what to do about the television of athletic contests. Although attendance at football games increased at most schools on the Coast last fall, the institutions from the concentrated television areas had decidedly smaller crowds. In the Oregon area without television and with two major teams that were not in the race for top honors, attendance records soared. In the Los Angeles area, however, where there are estimated to be 300,000 receiving sets, two major teams, that were contenders to the last game, televised their contests and played to disappointingly small crowds.

Already, subsidized articles are appearing which are designed to spearhead a campaign to force the colleges into a widespread program of television. "Money grabbing" athletic departments are accused of deliberately depriving the privileges. No mention is made of the upswing in the sale of hospitalized veterans, the aged and the shut-ins of their television sets when collegiate contests are televised.

Even the most ardent advocates of intercollegiate athletics frequently believe and state that crowds of the magnitude that sometimes turn out for our major football games should leave the athletic departments simply rolling in wealth. As a matter of fact, only football and basketball are self-supporting in most institutions, and the receipts from these must be allocated to support the other sports that go to make up a well-rounded program of major and minor sports. Consequently, any factor which decreases the returns from football, either eliminates other sports from the program, or reduces the number of students who can be allowed to participate.

If the television interests are sure of their repeated assertions that the video phase of broadcasting will within a few years increase attendance, as did audio broadcasting, why doesn't some smart chain make a long-term proposal to a popular team or conference to televise for free all sell-outs and simply pay for the vacant seats.

REPORTS OF
RULES AND TOURNAMENT COMMITTEES
ASSOCIATION FOOTBALL

The Soccer Rules Committee of the N.C.A.A. met January 12, 1950. The following rule changes were adopted:

Law 1. Dimensions — The field of play will be rectangular, its length being not more than 120 yards nor less than 110 yards and its breadth not more than 75 yards nor less than 65 yards. (In the interest of uniformity, it is desirable in all cases the dimensions of the field be 120 yards in length and 75 yards in breadth.)

Law 3. Note: It is suggested that when schools make their contracts with opponent schools, that agreement be reached concerning substitutes.

Law 4. Shoes must conform to the following standards: All cleats, studs or bars, shall be not less than half-inch in diameter or width and shall not project from sole and heel of shoe more than one half-inch.

Approved Rulings were confirmed.

Numbers on Jerseys is mandatory, minimum size of numerals 6 inches.

Law 7. Student managers are to be in charge of time; they will be instructed by referees concerning time out. A manager from each contestant be the official timers.

Law 6. Note: Referee will make all decisions on touch-line outs.

Extra ball must be available when ball is kicked out of play.

Law 12. Fouling — kicking or tripping or jumping.

Should read: A player shall be penalized if he, etc. Delete the word "intentionally" because the referee is sole judge of fact.

(G) There will be **no charging of Goalkeeper** when in possession. He will be allowed and restricted to four steps to get rid of the ball. If he fails to do this, an indirect free kick will be awarded against him.

Note: For the privilege afforded the goalkeeper by this no charge decree, he must not attempt to abuse same.

(K) is then deleted.

Law 15. Throw-in Becomes Kick-in.

When the whole of the ball passes over the touch line, either on the ground or in the air, it shall be **Kicked-In** from the point where it crossed the line, in any direction,

by a player of the team opposite to that of the player who last touched it. The ball shall be in play immediately when it is kicked, but the kicker shall not again play the ball until it has been touched or played by another player. A goal shall not be scored direct from a kick-in.

A player cannot be offside on a kick-in from touch, but this protection ceases the moment a second player plays the ball. On the kick-in the opponents must stand at least ten yards away from the ball, until kicked.

Penalty for the kicker, in kicking the ball twice before it has been played by a second player, indirect free-kick for the opposing team.

WILLIAM JEFFREY, Pennsylvania State,
Chairman, Rules Committee

BASEBALL

THE National Collegiate Athletic Association held their third College Baseball Tournament at Wichita, Kansas, June 22-25, 1949.

At the San Francisco meetings of the Association, on the recommendation of the Baseball Committee and the Baseball Coaches Association, the championship finals were changed from a two team playoff to a four-team, double elimination tournament. This change was due to the financial loss of the sectional and final tournaments in 1948. The cost of those tournaments were approximately \$20,000. The deficit was about \$13,000 of which the National Collegiate Athletic Association absorbed \$4,000 and the eight competing institutions, \$9,000.

The Baseball Committee awarded the 1949 final tournament to the University of Wichita. On March 29 a memorandum was issued to all member institutions which outlined the plan of the playoff, established the regulations for the conduct of the games and appointed District Selection Committees.

Walter Byers, Chairman of the Publicity Committee did an exceptional job of promotion, when he appointed a publicity chairman in each district. The district chairmen were all active college publicity men and they sent Byers and the Wichita area weekly material as to the college baseball in their district. This practice should be fully exploited and improved to where every college publicity man is sending to the publicity chairman weekly reports on the progress of their teams.

The University of Wichita and its Athletic Director, Jim Trimble, staged a most successful tournament. We wish to commend them and the city of Wichita, The National Base-

ball Congress, the Press, Radio, Civic Organizations, and individuals for the hospitality to the teams and their support of the tournaments. The tournament was played under the lights in the Wichita Municipal Stadium with seating of 12,000. Mayor William Salome, Jr. entered into the spirit of the event and proclaimed National Collegiate Baseball Week June 19-25. The Wichita Theaters gave free admission to visiting teams and the Park Board made their swimming pools and golf course available for the ball players in their leisure hours.

The tournament was well attended and the gross receipts were \$11,655.87. After the payment of all local expense, there was a tournament net of \$8,144.23. This item together with income from district and regional tournaments and the N.C.A.A., totaled \$10,233.89. There was \$1,190.61 expense in conducting the tournament, which left \$9,043.28. This amount was prorated to the four participating teams. There was a deficit of \$1,678.82 which was absorbed by the four participating teams. A copy of the financial statement is printed in the Appendix of this Yearbook.

The Tournament Committee wishes to take this opportunity of expressing its thanks to all who participated in or gave their support to the playoffs, including the fans who attended the games.

The following are the playoff results:

District 1: Boston College was selected outright by the District 1 Selection Committee.

District 2: In a district double elimination tournament with Penn State, Rutgers, Seton Hall and St. Johns of Brooklyn, St. Johns defeated Penn State in the seventh and final game of the Tournament 7 - 5.

District 3: Wake Forest won the district tournament at Charlotte, N. C. June 8 - 11, playing against Mississippi State, Kentucky and the University of Richmond.

District 4: Notre Dame won the district title in a double elimination tournament with Purdue, Western Michigan and Indiana.

District 5: Oklahoma A. & M. defeated Kansas in a playoff at Stillwater, Okla., June 7-8-9.

District 6: Texas, the champion of the Southwest Conference, was selected as the District 6 representative.

District 7: Colorado State College of Greeley, Colorado was selected as District 7 representative.

District 8: University of Southern California, champion of the Pacific Coast Conference, was selected as District 8 representative.

The eight district representatives entered four regional tournaments. The teams of Districts 1 and 2 played in the Region A tournament; Districts 3 and 4 in Region B, Districts 5 and 6 in Region C, and Districts 7 and 8 in Region D. The results were:

Region A: Brooklyn, N.Y., June 17-18: St. John's defeated Boston College.

Region B: South Bend, Ind., June 17-18: Wake Forest defeated Notre Dame.

Region C: Austin, Tex., June 16-17-18: Texas defeated Oklahoma A. & M.

✓ **Region D:** Los Angeles, Calif., June 15-16: University of Southern California defeated Colorado College.

The championship finals were held at the Municipal Stadium, Wichita, June 22-25. The boxscores follow. The final standings in the championship round showed:

Team	Won	Lost
Texas	3	0
Wake Forest	2	2
Southern California	1	2
St. John's	0	2

Upon recommendation of the Baseball Committee, the 1950 tournament was awarded to Omaha, Neb., where the University of Nebraska, Creighton University and Omaha University will jointly sponsor the championships. The 1950 playoff will be an eight-team, double elimination tournament with the top team of each district to enter the championship finals.

The box scores of the final games follow:

Games of June 22

Wake Forest	AB	R	H	S. California	AB	R	H
Hoch, ss	5	0	0	Cedillos, 3b	4	0	1
Hooks, 3b	4	1	2	Mazmanian, 2b	4	0	0
Teague, 2b	5	0	0	Brideweser, ss	4	0	0
Fulghum, 1f	3	0	1	Regolado, 1b	3	1	0
Livick, rf	3	0	1	Karan, cf	3	0	1
Kersch, cf	3	0	0	McKelvey, c	4	0	0
Warren, 1b	4	0	1	Sharman, 1f	4	0	0
Batchelor, c	3	0	1	Zuber, rf	4	0	0
Nicholas, p	4	1	0	Schlarb, p	4	0	1
	—	—	—	Pender, p	0	0	0
Totals	34	2	6	Totals	34	1	3

Wake Forest 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 — 2
Southern California 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 — 1

Errors — Cedillos, Hoch, Batchelor. Runs batted in — Fulghum, Hooks. Two-base hits — Hooks. Stolen bases — Hooks, Batchelor, Kersch, Regolado, Karan. Bases on Balls — Nicholas 5, Schlarb 7. Hits off — Nicholas 3 for 1 run in 10 innings; Schlarb 6 for 2 runs in 9½ innings; Pender 0 for 0 runs in ½ inning. Hit by pitcher, by — Schlarb (Hooks). Wild pitches — Nicholas, Schlarb. Losing pitcher — Schlarb. Umpires — Paul, Whitney. Scorer — Angley.

Texas U.	AB	R	H	St. John's University	AB	R	H
Womack, 1f	5	2	2	West, 2b	4	0	0
Hunt, ss	4	1	1	Roszman, ss	4	0	3
Shamblin, 2b	4	0	0	Bohner, 3b	2	0	0
Hamilton, 1b	3	3	2	Garin, rf	4	0	0
Kneuper, rf	4	1	1	Kaiser, cf	4	1	3
Brock, cf	4	0	1	Tolan, rf	2	0	0
Kana, 3b	4	0	0	Felton, 1b	4	0	2
Watson, c	3	0	0	Miller, c	2	0	0
Wall, p	4	0	0	Novak, p	0	0	0
	—	—	—	Gordon, p	2	0	0
Totals	35	7	7	Doyle, rf	2	0	0
				Hodan	1	0	0
				Torre, p	1	0	0
				Lynch, c	0	0	0
				McKenzie	1	0	0
				Totals	33	1	8

Doyle hit for Tolan in 7th
Hodan hit for Miller in 7th
McKenzie hit for Bohner in 8th

Texas U.	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	—	7
St. John's University	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	—	1

Games of June 23

Wake Forest	AB	R	H	Texas U.	AB	R	H
Hoch, ss	5	0	1	Womack, lf	5	2	4
Hooks, 3b	4	1	2	Hunt, ss	5	2	3
Teague, 2b	5	0	1	Shamblin, 2b	3	0	0
Fulghum, lf	4	0	3	Hamilton, 1b	4	1	2
Livich, rf	3	0	0	Kneuper, rf	3	2	2
Kersch, cf	4	0	0	Brock, cf	4	0	2
Warren, 1b	4	0	1	Kana, 3b	4	0	1
Batchelor, c	4	0	1	Watson, c	4	1	1
Bauer, p	1	0	0	Gorin, p	2	0	0
Wrenn	1	0	0	Totals	34	8	15
Kinlaw, p	1	0	1				
Vander Clute	1	0	0				
	—	—	—				
Totals	37	1	10				

Wrenn hit for Bauer in 6th

Vander Clute hit for Kinlaw in 9th

Wake Forest	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	—	1
Texas U.	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	—	8

Errors — Shamblin, Teague, Hunt. Runs batted in — Hunt 2, Hamilton, Kana, Kneuper 2, Fulghum, Womack. Two-base hits — Hunt 2, Fulghum. Three-base hits — Hamilton. Home runs — Hooks, Kneuper. Sacrifices — Shamblin 2, Gorin. Double play — Teague to Hoch to Warren. Bases on balls — Bauer 1, Kinlaw 1, Gorin 1. Strike outs — Bauer 2, Kinlaw 1, Gorin 7. Hits off — Bauer 9 for 5 runs in 5 innings; Goren 10 for 1 in 9; Kinlaw 6 for 3 in 3 innings. Hit by pitcher — by Goren (Hooks). Wild pitches — Kinlaw. Losing pitcher — Bauer. Umpires — Brady, Paul, Carpenter. Scorer — Angley.

St. Johns Univ.	AB	R	H	Southern Calif.	AB	R	H
West, 2b	2	0	0	Cedillos, 3b	5	2	2
Roszman, ss	4	2	0	Mazmanian, 2b ...	5	2	2
Bohner, 3b	4	1	1	Brideweser, ss ...	5	3	4
Kaiser, cf	4	1	0	Regolado, 1b	5	0	0
Novak, rf	4	0	1	Karan, cf	4	1	2
Garin, lf	3	0	0	McKelvey, c	5	0	0
Felton, 1b	3	0	0	Sharman, lf	3	2	1
Miller, c	2	0	0	Zuber, c	3	1	2
Brown, p	2	0	0	Fiedler, p	2	0	1
Tolan	1	0	1	Roundy, c	0	1	0
McKenzie	0	0	0	Totals....	37	12	14
Gordon, p	0	0	0				
Shanahan, rf	0	0	0				
Doyle, lf	1	0	0				
Lynch, c	1	0	0				
	—	—	—				
Totals	31	4	3				

Tolan hit for Brown in 7th

McKenzie ran for Tolan in 7th

St. Johns	2	0	0	0	0	0	—	4
Southern California	0	0	4	0	1	1	2	4 x —12

Errors — Regolado, Miller, Bohner 2, Fiedler, Brideweser, Mazmanian 2, Kaiser. Runs batted in — Bohner, Novak, Cedillos 2, Mazmanian 2, Brideweser, Regolado, Zuber, Sharman, Karan. Two-base hits —

Brideweser. Three-base hits — Bohner. SB — Brideweser 2, Kaiser, Karan, Cedillos. Sacrifices — Fiedler. Double plays — Brideweser to Regalado, Mazmanian to Regalado. Left on bases — So. Calif. 6; St. Johns 4. Bases on balls — Brown 3, Gordon 0, Fiedler 4. Strikeouts — Brown 7, Gordon 1; Fiedler 7. Hits off — Brown 7 for 6 runs in 6 innings; Gordon 7 for 6 runs in 2 innings; Fiedler 3 for 4 runs in 9 innings. Hit by pitcher — Gordon (Karan). Losing pitcher — Brown. Winning pitcher — Fiedler. Umpires, Massey, Carpenter, and Brady. Scorer — Angley.

Game of June 24

Southern Calif.	AB	R	H	Wake Forest	AB	R	H
Cedillos, 3b	5	0	1	Hoch, ss	3	1	1
Mazmanian, 2b ...	4	0	1	Hooks, 3b	4	1	2
Brideweser, ss	4	0	1	Teague, 2b	6	0	3
Regalado, 1b	5	1	0	Fulghum, lf	4	0	2
Karan, cf	4	0	0	Livick, rf	3	0	1
McKelvey, c	4	0	1	Kersh, cf	4	0	0
Sharman, lf	5	0	2	Warren, 1b	4	0	0
Zuber, rf	5	0	0	Batchelor, c	4	0	1
Pender, p	3	0	0	Vander Clute, p ..	3	0	0
Riach	1	0	0	Rogers	0	0	0
Schlarb, p	1	0	0	Harris, rf	0	0	0
Roundy, rf	0	0	0	Totals	35	2	10
	—	—	—	Totals	41	1	6

Southern California 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 — 1
Wake Forest 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 — 2

Errors — Hooks, Brideweser, Hoch 2, Schlarb. Runs batted in — Sharman, Teague 2. Two-base hits — Mazmanian, Brideweser. Three-base hit — Teague. Stolen base — Livick. Sacrifice — Hoch. Double plays — Brideweser and Mazmanian and Regalado 3, Vander Clute and Hoch and Warren, Mazmanian and Brideweser and Regalado, Cedillos and Regalado, Vander Clute and Hoch and Warren, Bases on balls — Pender 5, Schlarb 5, Vander Clute 4. Strike outs — Pender 4, Schlarb 2, Vander Clute 7. Hits off — Pender 8 for 1 run in 8 innings; Vander Clute 6 for 1 in 12; Schlarb 2 for 1 in 3 1/2. Hit by Pitcher — By Pender (Batchelor) (Hoch), Vander Clute (McKelvey). Losing pitcher — Schlarb. Umpires — Carpenter, Brady, and Massey. Scorer — Angley.

Game of June 25

Texas U.	AB	R	H	Wake Forest	AB	R	H
Womack, lf	6	0	1	Hoch, ss	5	1	1
Hunt, ss	4	3	2	Hooks, 3b	3	1	0
Shamblin, 2b	6	3	5	Teague, 2b	5	0	3
Hamilton, 1b	5	2	2	Fulghum, lf	5	1	0
Kneuper, rf	5	1	3	Harris, rf	4	0	1
Brock, cf	5	0	0	Kersh, cf	2	0	0
Kana, 3b	5	1	2	Warren, 1b	3	0	0
Watson, c	5	0	2	Batchelor, c	3	0	0
Wall, p	2	0	1	Nicholas, p	2	0	1
Ehrler, p	2	0	0	Bauer, p	0	0	0
Totals	45	10	18	Rogers	1	0	0
	—	—	—	Mustian, p	0	0	0
				Wrenn	0	0	0
				Matney, 1b	0	0	0
				Livick	0	0	0
				Totals	33	3	6

Texas	1	1	0	0	2	0	2	4	0	—10
Wake Forest	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	—	3

Errors — Hoch, Watson. Runs batted in — Kneuper 2, Wall, Teague, Shamblin, Hamilton 4, Watson, Wrenn. Two base hits — Kana, Hoch, Shamblin, Hunt. Three base hits — Teague, Shamblin. Home Run — Hamilton. Stolen bases — Fulghum, Harris, Hooks. Bases on balls — Wall 0, Ehrler 4, Nicholas 4, Bauer 0, Mustian 0. Strike outs — Wall 4, Ehrler 4, Nicholas 4, Bauer 1, Mustian 0. Hits off — Wall 4 for 2 runs in 4 2-3 innings; Nicholas 9 for 6 runs in 6; Ehrler 2 for 1 run in 4 1-3; Bauer 1 for 0 runs in 1; Mustian 8 for 4 runs in 2. Hit by pitcher — by Nicholas (Hunt), Ehrler (Hooks), (Batchelor). Winning pitcher — Ehrler, Wall. Losing pitcher — Nicholas. Umpires — Brady, Carpenter, Massey, Paul. Scorer — Angley.

FRANK G. MCCORMICK, Univ. of Minnesota,
Chairman, Tournament Committee

BASKETBALL

THE annual meeting of the Basketball Committee of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was held at the Olympic Hotel in Seattle, Washington, on March 26, 1949. All members, except one, were present as was Kenneth L. Wilson, Secretary-Treasurer of the N.C.A.A. George R. Edwards presided as chairman, and Ray Oosting acted as secretary of the meeting.

Recommendations and suggestions for alterations in the basketball playing code were presented by Paul Hinkle, representing the National Association of Basketball Coaches. The coaches desired the adoption on one type of ball, and the specification of transparent backboards for all college contests. They also urged that rules changes be made to eliminate unsatisfactory conditions which too often mark the waning moments of close games.

Arthur Lonborg, Chairman of the N.C.A.A. Basketball Tournament Committee, reported on the status of the post-season series currently being conducted, and asked for advice concerning several tournament administrative problems. Among these were the determination of policies connected with financial arrangements for district play-off; methods of selecting game officials; awards to participants; and contracts with radio and television stations.

Other business matters dealt with discussions concerning a standard scoring form for games, and improved methods of questionnaire distribution.

During the next two days the members assumed their duties as N.C.A.A. delegates to the annual meetings of the National Basketball Committee of the United States and Canada. Other organizations represented on the Committee

are: Amateur Athletic Union; Canadian Amateur Basketball Association; Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union; National Federation of High School Athletic Associations; and the Young Men's Christian Association.

Reports were submitted by subcommittees responsible for international relations, questionnaires, publications, research, and game administration. After discussion of this information, the group considered requests for changes in the playing regulations.

Many of the suggestions seemed unsound and were refused; several others simply involved clarification of existing rules; and a few required adoption of important but relatively minor alterations. Steps toward greater uniformity in playing equipment were taken in the adoption of specifications for an official ball; for one color on basket rings and braces; and for transparent rectangular back stops for college games.

The most troublesome problems dealt with changes needed to eradicate unsatisfactory situations commonly arising in the last few minutes of most games. The Committee was agreed that immediate and imperative necessity for such rules changes exists. However, in the absence of conclusive evidence it was unable to determine unanimously which of several proposed solutions should be selected. Many members feel that the one which ultimately received a majority vote is an improvement, but will fall short of expectations. All members believe that still better methods will be available after the new rules have been operated for a season of play, and detailed analysis of several assigned research projects is received.

Adjournment was ordered after nomination and election of officers for 1949-50. Those named, and the organization they represent, were as follows: Chairman, George R. Edwards (N.C.A.A.); Secretary, H. V. Porter (National Federation); Treasurer, Bruce Drake (N.C.A.A.); Editor, Oswald Tower (N.C.A.A.).

The Executive Committee will be composed of the officers and J. Mark Good (Y.M.C.A.), W. Alex Dewar (Canadian I.A.U.), and Louis G. Wilke (A.A.U.).

Chairmen of the standing subcommittees will be: International Relations, H. V. Porter (National Federation); Research, L. C. Butler (N.C.A.A.); Game Administration, Douglas R. Mills (N.C.A.A.); and Questionnaire, Lyle Quinn (National Federation).

GEORGE R. EDWARDS, Univ. of Missouri,
Chairman, Rules Committee

THE 1949 BASKETBALL TOURNAMENT

THE eleventh annual N.C.A.A. basketball tournament once again was an outstanding success due to the hard work of the individual tournament managers and the members of the Tournament Committee and the Selection Committees. For the first time, the Tournament Committee undertook to take the championship games to the northwest where the University of Washington was the host institution at Seattle. It marked the initial time the tournament had been west of the Rockies and the outstanding reception the northwest basketball fans gave to the N.C.A.A. championship finale was gratifying. The Western play-offs were held again in the Municipal Auditorium, Kansas City, Mo., while the Eastern play-offs were held at Madison Square Garden, New York. The Tournament Committee wishes to thank Mr. Harvey Cassill, Athletic Director of the University of Washington, and his fine staff all of whom cooperated and worked hard to make the tournament a success.

The final night found two opposing styles of basketball in the title game. The University of Kentucky, defending champion, met Oklahoma A. & M., two-time N.C.A.A. champion. Coach Iba's Oklahomans gave an outstanding demonstration of control basketball but it was not sufficient to contain Coach Rupp's Kentuckians. Kentucky annexed its second straight national championship while the University of Illinois defeated Oregon State for third place.

For the record, here's the list of National Collegiate champions since the tournament was inaugurated in 1939:

1939—University of Oregon
 1940—Indiana University
 1941—University of Wisconsin
 1942—Stanford University
 1943—University of Wyoming
 1944—University of Utah
 1945—Oklahoma A. & M.
 1946—Oklahoma A. & M.
 1947—Holy Cross College
 1948—University of Kentucky
 1949—University of Kentucky

A. C. LONBORG, Northwestern University,
Chairman, Tournament Committee

EAST - WEST CHAMPIONSHIP GAME

The Kentucky Wildcats returned to the winner's circle of national collegiate basketball for the second successive year as they defeated the defensive-minded Oklahoma Aggies, 46 to 36, at Edmundson Pavilion, the University of Washington, March 26, 1949.

The Aggies, rated as one of the nation's best defensive clubs — if not the best — found themselves in an unaccustomed situation; that of seeing the game of ball control provided by the opposition. And the Wildcats did a workmanlike job of defense.

After a fairly even first half, Kentucky bounded back to throw a defensive pattern at the Aggies which they couldn't penetrate for eight minutes and 25 seconds. Meanwhile, Kentucky was pulling to a 35 to 23 lead. Oklahoma played without the services of Bob Harris most of the second half. Harris, star center, fouled out shortly after the second half started. However, the Aggies made one final bid and pulled to within 39-32 of the Kentuckians before big Alex Groza hit four points to decide the game.

Groza, who scored 25 points for the night, was selected as the tournament's outstanding performer for the second straight year.

In the first game, played before a capacity crowd which jammed the University of Washington's field house, Illinois subdued Oregon State College, 57 to 53. The Illini, Big Ten champions, were led by Wally Osterkorn who scored 17 points.

East vs. West Championship Final

Kentucky (46)			Oklahoma A. & M. (36)		
FG	FT	PF	FG	FT	PF
Jones, f	1	1	Yates, f	1	0
Line, f	2	1	Shelton, f	3	6
Groza, c	9	7	Harris, c	3	1
Beard, g	1	1	Bradley, c	0	3
Barker, g	1	3	Parks, g	2	3
Barnstable, g ..	1	1	Jaquet, g	0	1
Hirsch, g	1	0	McArthur, g	0	2
Totals	16	14	21	Pilgrim, g	0
			Smith, g	0	1
Total	9	18			36

Officials: Cliff Ogden and Abb Curtis

East vs. West Consolation

Illinois (57)			Oregon State (53)			
FG	FT	PF	FG	FT	PF	
Eddleman, f	5	1	5	Crandall, f	6	6
Kersulis, f	3	1	2	Rinearson, f	1	0
Green, f	3	1	5	Peterson, f	3	2
Anderson, f	0	0	1	Snyder, c	1	2
Osterkorn, c	6	5	5	Watt, c	3	0
Erickson, g	3	0	4	Fleming, c	1	3
Foley, g	2	3	4	Ballantyne, g	3	2
Sunderlage, g ..	1	0	0	Harper, g	1	0
Totals	23	11	26	Torrey, g	0	1
			Total	19	15	22

Officials: Hal Lee and Tim McCullough

EASTERN PLAYOFF

Three conference champions including the N.C.A.A. defending champion and one of the section's strongest independent quintets participated in the Eastern Regional N.C.A.A. playoffs at Madison Square Garden on March 21 and 22. The Eastern finalists continued their conquests by downing the Western representatives four nights later in the Seattle finals.

The University of Kentucky, defending N.C.A.A. title-holder and Southeastern Conference champions, defeated Villanova College, 85 to 72, and the University of Illinois the Western Conference court kings, 76 to 47, to annex the Eastern N.C.A.A. crown. The Big Ten quintet had triumphed over Yale, champions of the Eastern Inter-collegiate Basketball League, 71 to 67. In the consolation test Villanova downed Yale, 78 to 67. The opening night's schedule was full of fireworks with three N.C.A.A. records yielding to the Kentucky contingent. Coach Adolph Rupp's pupils from the Blue Grass wiped out the one team high score of 79 points chalked up by Arkansas in 1945 with their 85 tallies in the Villanova victory. The 157 point total of that contest erased the Arkansas-Oregon 155-point game total. Col. Rupp's Olympic veterans hit with 23 free-toss conversions in the same game to overcome Kansas State's 22 point mark of the previous year's tourney.

Alex Groza and Paul Arizin, Kentucky and Villanova scoring luminaries, each scored 30 points to miss George Glamack's 31-joint standard set by the North Carolinian back in 1941.

Kentucky's Groza tallied a total of 57 markers in his pair of Eastern tests and Arizin of the Mainliners was only five points down from his Blue Grass rival in his two Madison Square Garden games.

The Eastern regionals had the distinction of sparing the nation's three premier 20-point per game marksmen in Arizin, Groza, and Yale's Tony Lavelli. This was the first time there had been such an array of scorers in any one of the major court tournaments since George Mikan of DePaul made his 1946 bid in the National Invitation tourney. Lavelli during the Yale 28-game season had totaled 636 points. Arizin's 542 point total was chalked up in 25 games and Groza had scored 614 counters in 31 engagements.

It was truly a "tournament of champions" — teams and individuals.

Eastern Championship Final

Kentucky (76)				Illinois (47)					
FG	FT	P	TP	FG	FT	P	TP		
Jones, lf	4	1	3	9	Eddleman, lf	3	0	1	6
Hirsch	3	0	1	6	Foley	1	1	1	3
Line, rf	6	3	0	15	Gatewood	3	0	0	6
Barnstable	1	0	1	2	Kersulis, rf	3	3	2	9
Groza, c	10	7	4	27	Marks	1	0	2	2
Beard, lg	4	1	2	9	Cottrell	0	0	1	0
Barker, rg	3	2	3	8	Green, c	3	1	2	7
	—	—	—		Anderson	0	0	1	0
31	14	14	76		Osterkorn, lg	2	1	5	5
	—	—	—		Beach	1	0	0	2
	—	—	—		Erickson, rg	2	1	2	5
	—	—	—		Sunderlage	0	2	2	2
	—	—	—			—	—	—	—
	—	—	—		19	9	19	47	

OFFICIALS — Matthew W. Begovich and Anthony Gentile
FIRST HALF SCORE — Kentucky 39; Illinois 22

Eastern Consolation

Villanova (78)				Yale (67)					
FG	FT	P	TP	FG	FT	P	TP		
Ricca, lf	5	3	5	13	Anderson, lf	5	1	4	12
Raiken, rf	6	3	2	15	Johnson	2	0	1	4
Arizin, c	7	8	3	22	Lavelli, rf	1	6	3	8
Weglicki	1	1	0	3	Osbourne	0	0	1	0

Wolf, lg	0	0	4	0	Joyce, c	1	1	4	3
Hannan, rg	12	1	2	25	DeCoursey	1	1	2	3
	—	—	—	—	Fitzgerald, lg ..	6	0	0	12
	31	16	16	78	Jackson	2	3	2	7
	—	—	—	—	Nadherny, rg ..	4	0	1	8
	—	—	—	—	Upjohn	5	0	1	10
	—	—	—	—		—	—	—	—
	—	—	—	—	27	13	19	67	

OFFICIALS — Gil McDonald and Bowser Chest
FIRST HALF SCORE — Villanova 33; Yale 31

Eastern Semi-Finals

Illinois (71)				Yale (67)					
FG	FT	P	TP	FG	FT	P	TP		
Eddleman, lf	5	1	4	11	Anderson, lf	7	5	4	19
Foley	2	0	1	4	Johnson	0	1	0	1
Osterkorn, rf	5	5	3	15	Lavelli, rf	10	7	3	27
Green, c	4	2	2	10	Osbourn	1	0	0	2
Kersulis	3	1	3	7	Joyce, c	4	1	5	9
Erickson, lg	1	3	3	5	Fitzgerald, lg ..	1	3	3	5
Sunderlage	7	1	5	15	Nadherny, rg ..	2	0	2	4
Anderson	2	0	1	4	Upjohn	0	0	0	0
Marks, rg	0	0	1	0		—	—	—	—
	—	—	—	—	25	17	18	67	
	—	—	—	—	29	13	23	71	

OFFICIALS — Matthew Begovich and Bowser Chest
FIRST HALF SCORE — Yale 35; Illinois 31

Kentucky (85)

Kentucky (85)				Villanova (72)					
FG	FT	P	TP	FG	FT	P	TP		
Jones, lf	0	4	5	4	Ricca, lf	6	2	5	14
Hirsch	1	0	3	2	DelPurgatorio ..	2	0	2	4
Line, rf	9	3	5	21	Raiken, rf	3	0	5	6
Barnstable	2	1	2	5	Gecker	0	0	0	0
Groza, c	12	6	4	30	Arizin, c	11	8	5	30
Day	1	0	1	2	Weglicki	2	1	2	5
Beard, lg	0	3	3	3	Wolf, lg	0	2	3	2
Barker, rg	6	6	3	18	Dolan	1	0	0	2
	—	—	—	—	Hannan, rg	3	1	2	7
	—	—	—	—	Crossin	0	2	1	2
	—	—	—	—		—	—	—	—
	—	—	—	—	28	16	25	72	
	—	—	—	—	31	23	26	85	

OFFICIALS — Gil McDonald and Anthony Gentile
FIRST HALF SCORE — Kentucky 48; Villanova 37

WESTERN PLAYOFF

Oklahoma A. and M.'s precisionist Aggies, who cashed in 39.5 per cent of their field goals in two nights of play, captured the Western N.C.A.A. basketball play-off by overwhelming Oregon State 55 to 30.

It was the greatest of all the westerns as far as attendance and receipts were concerned. An estimated 20,400 fans crammed into Kansas City's Municipal Auditorium for the tenth annual event. The western grossed \$36,536 and produced a net of \$29,962.80. Two nights previously when Nebraska and Oklahoma A. and M. met to decide the fifth district representative, the gross was \$15,262 and a net of \$12,842.84. A. and M. won that contest from the Big-Seven co-champions, 52 to 35.

As a thrill-producer, the play-off developed one of the most hair-breath escapes in its history. That came when the Oklahoma Aggies

cashed in a field goal with four seconds to go and gained a 40 to 39 first-round victory over the Wyoming Cowboys. It was Jack Shelton's spinning shot from under the basket that gave Coach Henry Iba's crew passage into the finals.

In the companion piece of the opening night Oregon State had little difficulty in getting past Arkansas, 56 to 38.

The teams reversed their form on the final night. The Aggies, who had to scramble to down Wyoming, virtually coasted over the Oregonians. Arkansas, cold the opening night, rambled freely past Wyoming, 61 to 48, to take consolation honors.

For the Oklahoma Aggies it was the third time they had moved into the national finals. They won the title in 1945 and 1946.

The championship contest saw the Aggies score first and go on to maintain the lead which at one time reached a maximum of 27 points.

Coach Slats Gill of the Beavers employed various strategical twists on the Oklahomans. He employed a zone defense the first half and a slow-breaking, post-less offense. In the second half the Beavers went to a man-for-man defense and a rolling offense. Gill even tried substituting by teams.

It was just an Aggie night. They hit 17 of their 36 field shots for 47 per cent and cashed in 21 of 24 free throws as they wasted little effort. The Beavers had a 25 per cent shot chart, canning 11 of 43.

Bob Harris, Oklahoma's center, poured in 23 points, on eight goals and seven free throws, for the top scoring effort of the play-off.

In the consolation affair Wyoming held a 3-0 lead after three minutes of play, but two minutes later the Arkansas Razorbacks took the advantage and went on, never to be headed. Arkansas was in front, 33 to 23 at the intermission.

Mack Peyton of Arkansas and Cliff Horton of Wyoming each collected sixteen points during the session.

Arkansas, the shootingest team in the play-off, fired 70 times against the westerners and connected with 27 for 38 per cent. Wyoming, on the other hand, collected 17 baskets on 61 attempts for 29 per cent.

Western Championship Final

Oklahoma A. & M. (55)

	G	FT	F		G	FT	F
Shelton, f	3	7	3	Petersen, f	2	0	5
Hobbs, f	0	0	0	Catterall, f	0	1	1
Yates, f	0	0	0	Sliper, f	0	0	1
McArthur, f	0	0	2	Fleming, f	1	0	0
Pilgrim, f	0	0	4	Snyder, c	1	0	1
Harris, c	8	7	1	Watt, c	0	0	1
Bradley, g	3	1	1	Rinearson, c	0	0	2
Jaquet, g	0	0	0	Crandall, g	4	3	3
Allen, g	0	0	1	Harper, g	1	0	1
Parks, g	2	4	2	Ballantyne, g	1	1	2
Smith, g	1	2	1	Torrey, g	0	1	0
Hayes, g	0	0	1	Holman, g	1	2	1
Totals	17	21	16	Totals	11	8	18

Half score — Oklahoma A. & M. 21; Oregon State 11

Free throws missed — Oklahoma A. & M.: Shelton, Parks, 2. Oregon State: Petersen 3, Catterall, Fleming, Crandall, Harper.

Officials — Abb Curtis and Richard Ball

Western Consolation

Arkansas (61)

	G	FT	F		G	FT	F
Cathcart, f	4	0	4	Doty, f	1	2	2
Horton, f	7	2	4	Larson, f	0	0	0
Ambler, c	5	3	1	Bloom, f	0	3	2
Coleman, c	1	0	0	Livingstone, c	3	0	3
Kearns, g	7	0	5	Reed, g	2	3	3
Williams, g	1	0	1	Peyton, g	7	2	0
Rankin, g	0	0	0	Pilch, g	4	4	3
Campbell, g	2	2	4	Totals	17	14	13
Totals	27	7	19				

Half score — Arkansas 33; Wyoming 23

Free throws missed — Arkansas: Cathcart, Horton 3, Ambler 2, Coleman. Wyoming: Doty 2, Larson, Livingstone 3, Peyton
Officials — Lloyd Leith and Cliff Ogden

Western Semi-Finals

Oklahoma A. & M. (40)

	G	FT	F		G	FT	F
Parks, f	2	2	4	Doty, f	1	4	4
McArthur, f	1	0	0	Bloom, f	3	3	1
Hobbs, f	0	0	1	Livingstone, c	4	0	3
Shelton, f	5	6	3	Peyton, g	1	0	1
Pilgrim, f	0	0	1	Pilch, g	6	2	5
Harris, c	2	0	4	Reed, g	0	0	0
Bradley, g	3	2	2	Totals	15	9	14
Yates, g	1	0	0				
Jaquet, g	1	0	5				
Totals	15	10	20				

Half score — Wyoming 25; Oklahoma A. & M. 22

Free throws missed — A. & M.: Parks, Shelton, Pilgrim, Harris, Bradley 2. Wyoming: Doty 6, Bloom 2, Livingstone, Peyton, Pilch 2.
Officials — Abb Curtis and Lloyd Leith

Oregon State (56)

Arkansas (38)

	G	FT	F		G	FT	F
Crandall, f	3	7	4	Cathcart, f	2	2	5
Rinearson, f	0	1	2	Horton, f	4	4	5
Petersen, f	5	0	1	Adams, f	0	0	0
Sliper, f	1	0	0	Ambler, c	2	0	1
Fleming, c	1	0	3	Price, c	0	0	2
Snyder, c	0	0	1	Coleman, c	0	2	0
Watt, c	1	0	2	Kearns, g	1	1	4
Ballantyne, g	2	9	1	Williams, g	0	2	2
Torrey, g	3	0	4	Hudspeth, g	0	0	2
Harper, g	2	3	2	Campbell, g	2	1	3
Holman, g	0	0	0	Rankin, g	2	0	0
Catterall, g	0	0	1	Totals	13	12	24
Totals	18	20	21				

Half score — Oregon State 21; Arkansas 17

Free throws missed — Oregon State: Petersen, Fleming, Ballantyne 2, Torrey 2, Harper. Arkansas: Cathcart 2, Horton 2, Ambler 5, Campbell 2.
Officials — Cliff Ogden and Richard Ball

BOXING

THE 1949 N.C.A.A. Boxing Tournament was held for the first time at Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich., April 7-8-9. Athletic Director Ralph H. Young and his very able staff put on one of the finest tournaments we have ever held. The inspiring address of Dr. John A. Hannah, President of Michigan State, highlighted the occasion and should be read by everyone connected with athletics. It appears in the 1949 N.C.A.A. Official Boxing Guide.

The wonderful reception, smooth operation and precision in the conduct of the tournament was evidence of the time spent by our hosts in their meticulous preparation for a "big time" affair. The committee, to a man, felt this tournament ranked with the very best.

This was a tournament of champions. Of the 124 original entrees, 61 were finally accepted. The weighted, average record for the entrants was six wins and one loss. Thirty-four regional champions from coast to coast and six former N.C.A.A. champions were among the participants. Not a single boy was knocked out. The only injury sustained was the refracture of a previously broken nose.

Just before the tournament the Rules Committee voted unanimously to make the use of head guards mandatory for the tournament. The following official actions were taken and incorporated in the 1949 rules:

1. Complete recodification of the rules governing intercollegiate boxing.
2. Compulsory use of headguards in practice, dual matches and all phases of intercollegiate boxing.
3. Revision of methods of scoring with the introduction of an official system approved by the Rules Committee to govern all intercollegiate boxing.
4. Considerable confusion has existed concerning the eligibility of members of the Armed Forces during and following World War II. A joint meeting of a sub-committee of the N.C.A.A. Boxing Rules Committee and the Directors of the Special Services of the various branches of the Armed Forces was held in Washington, D.C., and the Armed Forces have indicated their willingness to protect the future eligibility of men now in the Armed Forces for intercollegiate competition.

5. A rule permitting colleges to engage Armed Forces teams in dual competition under the auspices of the college or station and under N.C.A.A. rules.

The following actions, four (4) were taken:

1. The committee is to study and report at the next meeting suggested improvements in methods of recording and announcing the results of contest to the audience.
2. The question of lowering the age of contestants from

18 to 16 years for extra scholastic competition was deferred until the 1950 meeting.

3. The committee through the N.C.A.A. Boxing Coaches Association requested that all member schools cooperate with those schools that are conducting research and investigations in college boxing. Everyone interested in the future of college boxing can help this most important study.

4. The annual rotation of the retiring president of the N.C.A.A. Boxing Coaches Association as a member of the Rules Committee is being requested of the Committee on Committees. Such representation will be mutually helpful and bring to the committee a new member annually who will be familiar with the problems of the coaches. Rotation rather than indeterminate tenure would permit more coaches to sit with the committee on matters of policy, rule changes, and matters of eligibility.

5. Despite several appeals to reconsider previous rulings on eligibility, the committee voted unanimously to declare ineligible for further competition, all college boxers, who while members of the Armed Forces, participated either as individuals or as members of teams in contests or tournaments in which civilians participated unless such contests or tournaments were governed by the official Boxing Rules of the N.C.A.A.

Unfortunately this may rule out some boys who unintentionally or through ignorance of existing rules have violated their eligibility. The importance of preserving boxing as a college sport with emphasis on only high school or preparatory school experience must be stressed. Boys who have had considerable experience in extra curricular boxing are unfair and unequal competition in a sport where only the skill of two competitors is pitted against each other.

World War II again created a situation where boys under the auspices of the Armed Forces had several years of competition and experience before entering college. Until this "crop" of more experienced boxers have graduated from college we will have some unequal competition. Within two years we can expect to get back to the prewar level. If there are any boys now boxing at an N.C.A.A. member school who are known to have violated N.C.A.A. Boxing Rules they should be reported to the N.C.A.A. Boxing Rules Committee for investigation and action.

College boxing at present is setting the pace for other amateur and even some professional boxing. Many of the rules and nearly all of the safety factors originally introduced in college circles are being copied by these other groups. We believe we can show the way by conducting the sport on the very highest plane and ultimately eliminate

much of the criticism now being leveled at the sport in general.

What happens in professional and some amateur boxing should not be charged against the sport in college circles. Our great effort must be directed toward providing against avoidable injuries by the proper coaching of only qualified contestants and with the utilization of every known safety measure and under rigid medical supervision.

Individual Results

125-pound Class: Champion: Wilbert O. Moss, Louisiana State; Runnerup: Mac Martinez, San Jose State.
130-pound Class: Champion: Ted Thrash, Louisiana State; Runnerup: Norm Walker, Idaho.
135-pound Class: Champion: Leonard Walker, Idaho; Runnerup: Pat Dougherty, Michigan State.
145-pound Class: Champion: Charles Davey, Michigan State; Runnerup: Don Dickinson, Wisconsin.
155-pound Class: Champion: Wayne Fontes, San Jose State; Runnerup: Ed Rieder, Maryland.
165-pound Class: Champion: Colin Connel, Minnesota; Runnerup: James Gemmell, Michigan State.
175-pound Class: Champion: Carl Bernardo, University of Miami; Runnerup: Peter Monfore, Army.
Heavyweight: Champion: Marty Crandell, Syracuse; Runnerup: Don Schaeffer, San Jose State.

Team Scoring

Louisiana State	20	Miami	9	Catholic Univ.	2
Michigan State	18	Syracuse	8	Washington State	2
San Jose State	17	Maryland	5	DePaul	1
Idaho	13	Wisconsin	4	Virginia	1
Minnesota	11	Army	4	Superior Techs.	1

The John S. LaRose Memorial Trophy was awarded again to Charles P. Davey of Michigan State College.

DR. W. J. BLECKWENN, University of Wisconsin,
Chairman, Rules Committee

FENCING

THE N.C.A.A. Fencing Rules Committee held its annual meeting at New York, on June 16th, 1949. Plans and rules for the N.C.A.A. Fencing Championships for 1950 were discussed and the following recommendations were made:

1. That the N.C.A.A. Fencing Championships for 1950 be held at Wayne University on March 24th and 25th.
2. That only one fencer in each weapon from the same school may compete in the tournament.
3. That a fencer may compete in one weapon only.
4. That there shall be no substitutions during the tournament.
5. That in the event of a fencer withdrawing from the tournament due to accident or other inability to continue in

the tournament, such accident or inability duly certified by the bout committee, the results achieved by the withdrawing fencer shall be scored as follows:

- a. If the withdrawing fencer has completed 80 per cent or more of the bouts he was scheduled to fence, the results of the bouts fenced shall stand. All bouts remaining unfenced shall be scored as defeat for the withdrawing contestant by default.
- b. If the withdrawing fencer has actually fenced less than 80 per cent of the bouts he was scheduled to fence, the results shall be completely cancelled in the same manner as if the withdrawing fencer has never entered the competition.

The Fifth Annual N.C.A.A. Fencing Championships were held March 25-26 at U.S. Military Academy, West Point, New York. Twenty-nine colleges entered the tournament and a complete round robin was conducted in each weapon. The electric epee scoring machine was used which saved valuable time.

College	Team Scoring			Stand-ing	
	Foil	Epee	Sabre		
Army	19	24	20*	63*	1
Rutgers	24	16	23	63	1
C.C.N.Y.	22	18	22	62	3
Navy	19	19	20	58	4
N.Y.U.	20	17	21	58	4
Chicago	6	24	18	48	6
Yale	16	20	12	48	6
Princeton	14	16	17	47	8
Brooklyn	19	11	16*	46*	9
Illinois	15	16	14*	45*	10
Ohio State	18	16	10	44	11
Wayne	12	12	20	44	11
Columbia	23	13	6	42	13
Mich. State	19	8	15	42	13
Cornell	17	13	11*	41*	15
Penn	17	12	12	41	15
Haverford	16	7	10*	33*	17
Buffalo	9	16	5	30	18
M.I.T.	16	7	7	30	18
Wesleyan	12	5	13	30	18
Trinity	0	12	15	27	21
Boston U.	7	1	18	26	22
Temple	13	no entry	13	26	22
Notre Dame	7	13	5**	25	24
Stevens	7	12	4	23	25
Wisconsin	6	11	5	22	26
Fordham	4	6	9	19	27
Colorado	1	6	9	16	28
Northwestern	no entry	no entry	13	13	29

* One win over Notre Dame deducted.

** Injured during 11th bout and withdrew.

Individual Results

(Foil)

NAME	COLLEGE	VICTORIES	STANDINGS
R. Tedeschi	Rutgers	24	1
R. Neilson	Columbia	23	2
F. Kramer	C.C.N.Y.	22	3
J. Cagnina	N.Y.U.	20	4
B. Cummings	Army	19	5
F. Smith	Navy	19	6
A. Spingarn	Brooklyn	19	7
W. Lacey	Mich. State	19	8
J. Bell	Ohio State	18	9
S. Baltrow	Cornell	17	10
N. Ostrofsky	Penn U.	17	11

Note: Ties were resolved by counting touches in accordance with A.F.L.A. Rules.

(Epee)

NAME	COLLEGE	VICTORIES	STANDINGS
R. Bowman	Army	24*	1
D. Thompson	Chicago	24*	2
R. French	Yale	20	3
W. Bryan	Navy	19	4
E. Bassin	C.C.N.Y.	18	5
L. Greenhaus	N.Y.U.	17	6
W. Kohsmann	Buffalo	16	7
J. Hughes	Princeton	16	8
H. Schadler	Ohio State	16	9
H. Osinski	Illinois	16	10
J. Funstan	Rutgers	16	11

* Fenced off for first place.

Note: Ties, except for first place, were resolved by counting touches in accordance with A.F.L.A. Rules.

(Saber)

NAME	COLLEGE	VICTORIES	STANDINGS
A. Trevis	Rutgers	23	1
E. Natanblut	C.C.N.Y.	22	2
H. Taxel	N.Y.U.	21	3
R. Watson	Wayne	20	4
S. Powel	Navy	20	5
C. Trubin	Army	20	6
J. Westley	Chicago	18	7
C. Dorman	Boston	18	8
C. Johnston	Princeton	17	9
R. Zaum	Brooklyn	16	10
R. Blum	Trinity	15	11
G. Custer	Mich. State	15	12

Note: Ties were resolved by counting touches in accordance with A.F.L.A. Rules.

ALVAR HERMANSON, Univ. of Chicago,
Chairman, Rules Committee

FOOTBALL

SINCE 1946 the Football Rules Committee has given much thought to the substitution rule. We have been liberal, perhaps too liberal, but we have tried to write a rule which would help the small institution with a limited squad of players and at the same time not give more strength to the colleges which have larger squads. Until this year I felt that we were on the right track. More boys were getting into games and this one feature made the revised rule more popular than the already liberalized substitution rule we had in 1942. I am afraid, however, (and I speak only for myself) that in permitting unlimited substitution when team possession of the ball changes we have given too much power to the larger squads and we have made it necessary for all colleges to maintain larger numbers on their squads. More than ever now you hear the expression that the players are "pawns" of the coach and in some instances some players never play offense and others never play defense. Furthermore, a new problem has arisen for the colleges which have limited budgets for there is now a demand for offensive and defensive coaching staffs. Finally, looking into the future, if coaches are to be recruited from boys who are now playing the game, many of them will not have experienced both offensive and defensive football.

The size of the scores during the past season would seem to indicate that the rules now give too much advantage to the offense. Personally I feel that players and spectators like offensive football. Have we gone too far?

Other changes in last year's rules have been responsible for reducing the number of fouls caused by illegal use of the hands and forearms. Football is rough and rugged but there is no place in it for what amounted to striking in the face as players separated after arm blocks.

The recodification, started in 1946, was finally completed in 1949. It has been a colossal undertaking and not easy of accomplishment. The Committee is grateful to the officers of the N.C.A.A. for permitting us to hold extra meetings and no less than 22 complete revisions were debated before the final one was approved. Since 1928 when the rules were last codified no attempt had been made to eliminate the notes, cross references and exceptions which prevailed throughout the rule book. The 1949 edition of the rules contains ten rules instead of thirteen; all notes and cross references have been eliminated and exceptions have been reduced to a minimum. Each article expresses a single thought and we have tried to use precise language.

With the recodification completed I have requested to be retired as Chairman. The principle of rotation is sound and

should be adopted for all committees for "Time marches on!" and times do change. I express deep appreciation to my colleagues and to the American Football Coaches Association for their sympathetic co-operation, patience, and understanding, especially when debates were spirited and problems difficult of solution.

WILLIAM J. BINGHAM, Harvard University,
Chairman, Rules Committee

GOLF

THE Fifty-second Annual Intercollegiate Golf Championships, sponsored by the National Collegiate Athletic Association, were held June 27 to July 2 at the Iowa State College Golf Course at Ames, Iowa. Iowa State acted as host and Mr. Louis Menze, Iowa State's genial Director of Athletics, and his entire staff of officials are to be congratulated on the organization and work they did to stage this great championship. The popularity of this tournament is proven by the record representation of schools from every section of the United States. Two hundred and fifteen qualifiers from 66 different schools made up the field. There were 31 full teams of four men or more in the team championship race.

Sunday afternoon prior to the qualifying rounds, the Annual East-West Exhibition match was held. Twenty-four picked stars from the East played a Best Ball Match against 24 stars from the West. The East team won 7-6. This makes the series stand eight matches for the East, five matches for the West and two ties in the 15-year-old series. Benton Alyea of U.C.L.A. won the Driving Contest with an average of 243 yards for three balls. Keith LeClair of Michigan won the longest individual drive with a drive of 260 yards.

On Sunday evening, June 26, the National Collegiate Golf Coaches Association met in the Union Building and held their annual business meeting with President Ellis P. Hagler of Duke University presiding. Mr. Burt Katzenmeyer of Michigan was elected President for 1949-50 and Mr. Robert Kepler of Ohio State was elected Secretary-Treasurer. Rev. George Holderith of Notre Dame was elected Vice-President.

Arnold Palmer, a sophomore from Wake Forest College, won the Medalist honors with a one under par score for the treacherous Iowa State Course of 141. This was two strokes off the record of 139 set at Stanford in 1948.

North Texas State College with a well-balanced team which shot consistently, won the Team Championship and was awarded the Maxwell Team Trophy with a score of 590. Purdue University and Texas University tied for second

with 600. Michigan was fourth with 602 and San Jose State College, defending team champions, was fifth with 603.

Harvie Ward, Jr., a junior from the University of North Carolina, won the Individual Championship by defeating Morris Williams of the University of Texas 5-4. Ward shot consistently par or better throughout the tournament and was one under par in the final match. Ward was awarded the "Chick Evans Bowl," emblematic of the individual championship.

Team Scoring

North Texas State College	590	University of California
Purdue University	600	(Berkeley) 636
Texas University	600	Canisius College 637
University of Michigan	602	Northwestern University 642
San Jose State College	603	University of Illinois 642
Oklahoma A. & M.	606	University of Missouri 642
Wake Forest College	608	University of Oklahoma 645
Ohio State University	610	St. Ambrose College 646
University of North Carolina	610	University of New Mexico 647
Miami University	613	Iowa State Teachers College 666
University of Utah	614	Cornell University 666
Iowa State College	619	Rochester University 669
U.C.L.A.	622	Kent State College 671
Washington State	624	Central Michigan 692
University of Iowa	627	University of Omaha 696
Yale University	629	Johns Hopkins University 720

Individual Results

(From the round of sixteen)

ROUND NO. 3

Arnold Palmer (Wake Forest) defeated Tom Sullivan (Miami), 5-4. Tommy Veech (Notre Dame) defeated John Hare (Purdue), 1 up. Harvie Ward (North Carolina) defeated Bo Wninger (Okl. A. & M.), 2 up. Gardner Dickenson (Louisiana State) defeated Dave Dennis (Kansas), 7-5. Morris Williams (Texas) defeated Bob McCall (Colgate), 5-4. Buster Reed (North Texas State) defeated Palmer Lawrence (No. Texas State), 2-1. Dave Laflin (Purdue) defeated Bill Johnston (Utah), 5-4. Eli Bariteau (San Jose) defeated Bob Travenick (So. Cal.), 5-3.

QUARTER-FINALS

Veech defeated Palmer, 4-3. Williams defeated Reed, 4-2. Ward defeated Dickinson, 7-5. Bariteau defeated Laflin, 3-2.

SEMI-FINALS

Ward defeated Veech, 4-3. Williams defeated Bariteau, 1 up

FINALS

Ward defeated Williams, 5-4.

TED B. PAYSEUR, Northwestern University,
Chairman, Tournament Committee

GYMNASICS

IN general. "Optimism" was the word for our 1948 report. In 1949 we can repeat it with greater confidence. The Rules and Advisory Committees and the Gymnastic Coaches at the meeting in Berkeley, California, this year had an excellent discussion for the good of our sport. Reports of new teams with new coaches show that interest in Gymnastics is growing. Outstanding suggestion of the meeting was Chet Phillips' idea for a National Association of Gymnastic Coaches and we are working out the details under the constitution proposed by Chet Phillips and agreed upon by all those present at our Berkeley meeting.

The N.C.A.A. meet was definitely a success with Charles Keeney of the University of California doing a beautiful job as host to sixteen schools representing almost every N.C.A.A. district in United States. Our optimism is based on present facts and our willingness to work hard in the future to further the interests of our gymnasts.

Rules Changes. The N.C.A.A. Gymnastic Rules Committee invited all coaches who wished to join our discussion to do so. The following changes were made in our rules as a result of discussion and vote:

1. Rope Climb has been included as a regular event to count for Team Score.
2. Added to Rope Climb rules, "If a climber ties or breaks the former record he shall be allowed an additional climb for record purposes only."
3. For Rope Climb, word "climb" is changed to "event."
4. Tumbling mats, for greater safety to the performer, are to be "2 to 4 inches thick."
5. In the All-Around event each contestant may make a choice of four of the following six events: Side Horse, Horizontal Bar, Parallel Bars, Flying Rings, Tumbling and Trampoline. The four events may include either Tumbling or Trampoline but not both.
6. A.A.U. method of five judges voiding high and low men and use of consultation on first exercise has been voted in.

Please write your Chairman if you do not receive your copy of the new rules revised in 1949.

The 1950 Championship Meet. At our rules meeting, Tom Maloney invited the members present to consider West Point as the place for our 1950 meet. It was accepted and the date of April 1, 1950, has been confirmed. This is in line with our policy of rotating the meet from Middle West, to West, to East, for best geographical distribution in terms of ease of travel for each district.

Reports of The Sections

More cause for optimism is the excellent response of all the volun-

teers in each N.C.A.A. District to the Chairman's idea that one man write up each District and then submit it to the Chairman for editing for this report. The men did a fine job and in every case the name of the man who did the job will be mentioned in this report. Because the men worked so hard on their reports, editing will be kept to a minimum and the reports will, for the most part, be exactly as submitted by the men who wrote them.

District 1. Mr. Judd volunteered but pointed out that there were not very many teams in this district. Apparently he was unable to get the information because no report has been received from this District.

District 2. (Prepared by Mr. Chet Phillips of the United States Naval Academy.) The members of the Eastern Intercollegiate Gymnastics League formed the hub of this District. All members of the League — Army, Navy, Penn State, Temple and Syracuse scheduled colleges and universities outside the League as well as numerous clubs. This system of lending a hand to the promotion of gymnastics at other schools is showing its effects. Syracuse is a new member of the League this year as a result of such co-operation and it appears that the University of Delaware will soon join the ranks by similar methods. Navy, the southernmost member, is cocking an eye to the infant Southern League and will be standing by to schedule their members whenever possible.

The Eastern League dual-meet season closed with Temple high, soon to ride rough-shod over all other colleges in the nation. Army snappet close at Temple's heels for second place while Syracuse made Army go all out before they accepted third place. The bitterest battle of the season was fought by Penn State and Navy. Navy won by one point.

The Individual Championships held at Temple did great credit to the sport. It was a masterfully run show with top-flight performances. Bob Stout of Temple retained his all-around crown for the third straight year, thus becoming the second man to accomplish this feat in the history of the League. Gene Rabbitt of Syracuse was master of the Side Horse. Joe Beranato, Temple's man, finished second. Army's Jack Hodes performed superbly on the horizontal bar and pushed Bob Stout back to second place, with Billy Bonsall, Penn State's member of the 1948 Olympic team, finishing third. Leo Minotti of Syracuse hung up a new rope-climb record for the League. He dethroned Navy's Schenker with a 3.5 secs. climb. Schenker could not get under 4 seconds. Bob Stout came through again on the parallel bars but Army's Carl Brunson pushed him hard. Punch Jamison, Army's daredevil, repeated his 1948 performance on the rings. His double flyaway climaxed a brilliant performance but he shone only a shade brighter than Bob Stout. The tumblers re-elected Bill Meade of Penn State as champ with his team-mate (watch this man) Rudy Valentino as runner-up.

The Eastern League used the five judge system for the first time in this year's Championship Meet. The system has been given unanimous approval for all future championship meets.

District 3. (Prepared by Hartley Price of Florida State University.) The Southern Gymnastic League was organized at the Atlanta Athletic Club on Saturday, April 16, 1949. The purpose of the organization is to promote interscholastic and intercollegiate competitive gymnastics in Florida, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Georgia.

Hartley Price of Florida State University was elected President and Lyle Welser of Georgia Tech was elected Executive Secretary. Other members of Executive Council include:

Coach Bill Alexander	Director of Athletics, Georgia Tech
Major Joseph Burns	Riverside Military Academy
Major W. A. Curry	Georgia Military Academy
James Baley	Duke University
Tom McDonough	Emory University
Richard Tews	University of Georgia
Clayton Cornish	Howard College
Dr. Frank Haar	University of Florida
Mr. William Johnson	University of Kentucky
Francis Drury	Louisiana State University
Joe Piscopo	Northwestern State College
Dave Field	University of Maryland

Schedules were tentatively made for Varsity competition next year. The First Annual Southern Gymnastic League Intercollegiate Championship Meet will be held at Georgia Tech on Friday, April 28. The following day, a Meet will be held to determine championship for prep schools and high schools respectively.

Price has already organized a Gymkana Troupe with seventh and eighth graders who will be available to stimulate gymnastics in communities throughout Florida. Dave Field's Gymkana at the University of Maryland is going great and he should have some fine gymnasts very shortly. Dave's organization is now several years old.

District 4. (Prepared by Newton Loken of the University of Michigan.) This has been the "bumper" year for gymnastics in the fourth district. Every institution in the Big Ten competed last year with one exception, Northwestern, and expectations are high that they will join us within another year or so. The schools with Varsity gymnastic teams in this district are: Kent State University, Kent, Ohio; Ohio State University; Michigan State College; University of Chicago; Indiana University; University of Illinois; University of Illinois (Navy Pier); University of Iowa; University of Wisconsin; University of Minnesota; and University of Michigan. Purdue University has a team on a Gymnastic Club basis.

The outstanding gymnasts of this district are many and may include William Rotzheim from the University of Illinois, Navy Pier. He won the Western Open All-Around Crown and the National A.A.U. All-Around Title. Through his efforts plus that of his team-mate, Irving Bedard, A.A.U. tumbling champ, Navy Pier won the team A.A.U. title. Another definite stand-out was Joe Kotys, Kent State University, who was often referred to as the one-man team from Kent. The results in the Western Open, N.C.A.A. and National A.A.U. will verify this. Mel Stout from Michigan State College was also a one-man show in the Western Open, N.C.A.A. and National A.A.U. Another outstanding man was Jim Peterson of Minnesota. He annexed the Western Conference All-Around title for his third year in succession. This feat had never been done before in Big Ten Gymnastic competition. Through his outstanding ability and that of his "top notch" team mates, Don Hedstrom, Howard Swanson, and Herb Loken, Minnesota won the Western Conference team title for the third year in succession and placed second in the National Collegiate at California. A close-up on Peterson shows that he is truly an all-around man as he also won two letters in track as a pole-vaulter and this spring was awarded the Conference Medal at Minnesota as the outstanding senior athlete. This was the first time a gymnast had ever received this fine award at the University of Minnesota. In passing out laurels, we must not pass up the steady reliable all-around gymnast, Frank Dolan, from Illinois. His perseverance and outstanding ability in gymnastics helped Illinois place second in the Western Conference meet and third in the National Collegiate.

The Western Conference Gymnastic Meet was held at the University of Michigan Sports Building for the first time in Michigan's history. The attendance was well over 1,000 for each session, afternoon and evening. One of the outstanding performers as voiced by the coaches and spectators was Pete Barthell, sophomore gymnast from the University of Michigan, who placed first on Parallel Bars and first on Tumbling mats. He was the only gymnast in the meet to win two first places.

Perhaps the most consistent winner of the entire district was Edsel Buchanan, sophomore from the University of Michigan. He won first place on the trampoline in every major meet of the entire season, namely: Western Conference, Western Open, N.C.A.A. and National A.A.U. This is the first time in the history of trampoline competition that any man has won first place in all four meets in one season.

The Big Ten Coaches at their May meeting voted unanimously to vary from the N.C.A.A. rules by eliminating the rope climb as an official event. The N.C.A.A. sanctions the rope climb as one of the official events. The coaches also voted in a more stringent rule (than the N.C.A.A.'s) regarding the trampoline event. The Big Ten rule states that:

1. There shall be only four spotters around the trampoline.
2. If a trampoliner falls off the trampoline or is prevented from falling off by the spotters his routine terminates at that point.
3. The trampoline bed shall be a "webbing" bed instead of the canvas and the attachments shall be of exercise cable or shock cord type instead of the springs.

The site for the Big Ten Meet next year is the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, on March 25th.

George Szypula, Gymnastic Coach, Michigan State College and Newt Loken, Gymnastic Coach, University of Michigan, sponsored a Gymnastic Clinic at Michigan State College on May 7th. The morning session was devoted to instruction and demonstration by varsity gymnasts from both schools. The afternoon session was confined to an informal work-out by the high school gymnasts along with the varsity gymnasts. Interest was keen as evidenced by the fine turnout. Plans are under way to duplicate this affair next year and to enlarge it to include an all-state Gymnastic Meet.

Joe Hewlitt is in the process of compiling information for assisting gymnastic judges in their job of judging meets.

Congratulations should be given to Charles Pond and his assistant Ray Runkle for their fine work in their first year at Illinois. They are certainly continuing the outstanding record compiled by Hartley Price.

A welcome and "nice going" to Dick Holzaepfel, Coach at the University of Iowa for his first year at that school. His trampoliners were excellent with unusual work done by sophomore Bruce Sidlinger.

District 5. (Prepared by Charles Vavra of the University of Colorado.) Three schools in this district consistently maintain teams, namely: Colorado State College of Education, Colorado A. & M. College, and University of Colorado. Wyoming University has teams intermittently. The quality of the performance is below that of other areas due largely to the fact that a large percentage of our gymnasts upon entering college have had no gymnastic training whatever.

To help correct this situation and for the purpose of encouraging high schools of the state to include gymnastics in their sport schedules, the Colorado High School Activities Association authorized the University of Colorado to sponsor state high school gymnastic meets. The first of these meets was held in 1948 with five schools entered. This year the same number of schools competed but more contestants participated. The schools that have teams are becoming enthusiastic

about the sport and others are becoming interested and plan to enter future meets. A marked improvement of performance has been noted in the state meet this year and in time this high school training should improve the quality of college competition in this area.

District 6. (Prepared by John P. Allred, Jr. of the University of Arizona.) The University of Arizona is the only N.C.A.A. member institution in District No. 6 that has a gymnastic team. Our team was organized in September, 1948. During the school year 1948-49 we put on twelve gymnastic exhibitions during the half of varsity basketball games, for local organizations, etc. On March 18 the First Annual University of Arizona All-Campus Gymnastic Meet was conducted. Approximately twenty-five students participated in this meet. On April 1st the University of Arizona sponsored the First Annual State A.A.U. Gymnastic Meet. Thirty gymnasts from four institutions participated. Dave Goodson of the University of Arizona won the all-around event with Joe Major, also a student of this institution, taking second. The Border Conference was represented at the N.C.A.A. Gymnastic Meet in Berkeley last April for the first time in its history when the University of Arizona sent two gymnasts (Dave Goodson and Joe Major) to the annual event.

District 7. (Prepared by Granville Johnson of Denver University.) The All-College Invitational Championships were held at the University of Nebraska. The meet was won by Colorado State College followed by Nebraska University, Colorado University, and Montana State. Colorado A. & M., Kansas State, and Iowa University had teams but did not attend.

The outstanding All-Around performer was Woolery of Colorado State. He won the Side Horse, Parallel Bars, and the All-Around. Second in the All-Around was Sprague of Nebraska, and third was Haase of Colorado U. Horizontal Bar was won by Gier of Nebraska; Rings won by Straus of Colorado State.

Haase of Colorado U. went to the N.C.A.A. in California and placed fifth on Trampoline and Woolery of Colorado State placed seventh on the Side Horse.

District 8. (Prepared by Harley Rockoff.) A new record was set in this league during the Gymnastics season. U.C.L.A. won the Pacific Coast Intercollegiates for the third straight year. They had a new coach this season and Mr. W. S. Corwin did a fine job. While they had few stars, U.C.L.A. functioned well as a team and had considerable depth. U.C.L.A. was first with 75½ points. The University of California took a surprise second with 62½ points. The University of Southern California came in third with 58 points and Stanford wound up fourth with 2 points. Outstanding performances were presented by Muir, Commander, and Brown of U.C.L.A.; Thompson and Anderson of U.C.; Todd and Foreman of U.S.C. During the season Foreman set a new record in the Rope Climb with a time of 3.2 seconds.

This is Your Report. Because this report is the property of coaches and gymnasts in the N.C.A.A. it is up to you to take personal interest in it. Check your Chairman on errors, send in suggestions for improvement. We are all anxious to serve and make gymnastics grow but the way to do it lies in the direction of hard work and a lot of it. Take the time to write your chairman if you see a way of improving our general set up. The Rules and Advisory Committee extend our thanks to all of you for your fine cooperation and for the excellent spirit of our organization.

The 1949 Championship Meet. The reports on the Districts have been so complete that there is not enough space to give all the results

of the Championship Meet at Berkeley. The meet was efficiently run by Charles Keeney at the University of California in Berkeley and capacity crowds saw the meet. The Chairman is sure that if you want the results of the meet they can be obtained from Charles Keeney if you will drop him a line. Running the championship meet is a tremendous task and we want to thank Mr. Keeney for doing such a fine job for the gymnasts and the coaches.

Team Scoring					
Temple	28	U.S.C.	14½	Occidental	1
Minnesota	18	Army	11	Arizona	0
Illinois	17½	Michigan	10	Colorado State	0
Kent State	17	U. C. L. A.	3	San Jose State	0
California	17	Colorado	2	Stanford	0
Michigan State	15				

ERWIN F. BEYER, Univ. of Chicago,
Chairman, Rules Committee

ICE HOCKEY

THE Ice Hockey Rules Committee of the N.C.A.A. met March 27 and 28 at Boston, Massachusetts. Present were Chairman Keller, Secretary Tirrell and Members Harmon, Murdoch, Thompson, Rogers and Moulton.

On Sunday evening an open meeting for coaches, officials, and others interested was held at Boston University on Commonwealth Avenue at which time many suggestions were presented. The Coaches Association having met just previous to this date, a Committee presented changes in the Rules recommended by this group and these were discussed generally at the Sunday evening meeting. The Committee met at nine o'clock on Monday morning at the Hotel Kenmore.

A bid for the 1950 N.C.A.A. Hockey Tournament was received from Colorado College and the Broadmoor Hotel in a letter from President Gill and Director of Athletics Juan Reid. It was moved by Dr. Harmon, seconded by Mr. Murdoch, and unanimously voted that this offer be accepted. The Secretary was instructed to forward the Committee's recommendations to the Executive Committee of the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

A letter from Secretary-Treasurer H. L. Cleverly of the New England Intercollegiate Hockey League concerning selection of teams for the 1950 Tournament was referred to the Selection Committee.

It was unanimously voted that the proposed price of \$1.00 for the Ice Hockey Guide is too high to serve the best interests of the game among schools, colleges and amateur clubs unless a separate edition containing only Rules is published and sold separately at a price of approximately twenty-five cents.

The second annual N.C.A.A. Ice Hockey tournament was held at the Broadmoor Ice Palace, Colorado Springs, Colorado, March 17-18-19, 1949, with Colorado College acting as host. The following men composed the tournament Committee:

Juan Reid, Director of Athletics, Colorado College, Chairman
Louis F. Keller, Chairman, N.C.A.A. Ice Hockey Rules Committee
Howard Olson, Chairman, Eligibility Committee, Colorado College
Chedy Thompson, Hockey Coach, Colorado College
Thayer Tutt, Assistant to the President, Broadmoor Hotel Co.

The three selection committees designated Colorado College as the Far-Western entry, University of Michigan as the Mid-Western entry, Dartmouth College, as the Pentagonal League entry, and Boston College, as the Eastern Intercollegiate Independent entry.

Boston College defeated Dartmouth College, 4 to 3, in the championship game after defeating Colorado College, 7 to 3, in the first round. Dartmouth College defeated the University of Michigan, 4 to 2, in the first round game for the right to meet Boston College in the final game. Michigan defeated Colorado College, 10 to 4, for third place.

The Associated Press, through the cooperation of the Tournament Committee, selected an official All-Tournament team and a most valuable player by polling officials, coaches and sports writers. The following men were selected:

First Team	Pos.	Second Team
Dick Desmond, Dartmouth	G	Billy Burke, Boston College
Mike Thayer, Dartmouth	D	Ron Newson, Colorado Col.
Jim Songin, Boston College	D	Lew Meier, Colorado College
John Mulhern, Boston College	C	W. Riley, Boston College
Wally Grant, Michigan	W	Wally Gacek, Michigan
J. Riley, Boston College	W	Connie Hill, Michigan
Most Valuable Player: Dick Desmond, Dartmouth College.		

LOUIS F. KELLER, University of Minnesota,
Chairman, Rules Committee

LACROSSE

THE academic year of 1948-1949 proved to be one of the most important in the intercollegiate history of Lacrosse.

During the year, several new members were admitted to the United States Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association; many other colleges and preparatory schools have included Lacrosse in their sports program.

Spectator interest increased as rapidly as the playing interest and was especially manifested at the Army-Navy game. Spectator interest was also at a peak in the games played in the Baltimore area and in Central New York state.

Perhaps the most revealing factor in the growth of Lacrosse interest was demonstrated at the time of the North-South game on June 11th, played at Troy, New York, on the campus of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. For the first time in the history of the eight years of this competition, it was played away from Baltimore (always considered the center of Lacrosse in the United States). A crowd of more than 8,000 witnessed the game, a new high for this event. This well-played contest was won by the team representing the South by a score of 11 to 6. The series now stands at four all.

The changes in playing rules were again held to a minimum, to the advantage, I believe, of both players and spectators.

The Wingate Memorial Trophy, awarded to that team considered to have had the best record by the Committee, was made jointly to the United States Naval Academy and to Johns Hopkins University. These teams had not played each other during the year.

HARRY J. ROCKAFELLER, Rutgers Univ.,
Chairman, Rules Committee

SWIMMING

THE 26th annual N.C.A.A. Swimming Championship, held in the South for the first time, was one of the outstanding swimming events of the entire season. This meet was held at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and attracted a record entry list, both institutional and individual.

The meet was conducted in the Bowman Gray Memorial Pool and although the seating arrangement was somewhat limited, the pool itself was excellent. The N.C.A.A. Rules Committee together with the visiting coaches both college and high school, numbered approximately 75. Officials were chosen from this group and has been the case in the past this proved to be a wise choice because the closeness of the competition demanded intelligent and efficient officiating.

There were 45 institutions represented, with about 240 individual competitors entered. This was the largest group we have ever had and practically every part of the country was represented with its best performers.

The team championship was won by Ohio State, coached by Mike Peppe, with a point score of 49 points. This fine

team was headed by two 1948 Olympic Champions, Bill Smith in the 440, and Bruce Harlan in the diving events. They were ably supported by many other stars but their power in the scoring column came from their grand array of divers.

The University of Iowa, with another 1948 Olympic winner in their midst, Wally Ris, of 100 meter fame, was in second place with 35 points, barely nosing out the University of Michigan with 32 points. Yale, La Salle, Purdue, Michigan State, Northwestern University, the University of North Carolina and Rutgers followed in order, making up the first ten teams. The leading individual point scorers were Harlan and Smith of Ohio, with 12 points each, followed by Carter, Purdue; Heusner, Northwestern; Verdeur, La Salle, and Weinberg, Michigan, each with 10 points. In all, 20 colleges and 33 individuals were listed in the point scoring column.

The outstanding individual performance, and there were many of exceptional merit this year, resulted in the dethroning of the World's record holder and Olympic Champion, Joe Verdeur, of La Salle, in his specialty event, the breast stroke. Keith Carter of Purdue University, brilliant all-around swimming star, is the new 1949 N.C.A.A. breast-stroke champion, having beaten Verdeur in 2.14.8. Perhaps the next best individual performance was the remarkable achievement of the new swimming star of the University of North Carolina, Jimmy Thomas, with his amazing performances in the backstroke and the 400 yards.

As is often the case when such a meet takes place for the first time in a new locale, the meet was not as successful financially. The total gross receipts were \$2,782.64, and net receipts were \$781.76.

Another innovation at this meet and one that was well worth while, was the taking of motion pictures of the entire meet. The University authorities made all of the arrangements and the pictures were ably taken by Prof. Ollie Cornwell, of the Physical Education Department. This gives the N.C.A.A. a visual record of this meet and will also permit the showing of these films throughout the country at the competing institutions. The Executive Committee of the N.C.A.A. is to be congratulated for approving the financing of this venture and praise should be given to the men who worked hard on this project.

Meetings of the Rules Committees for both swimming and diving, and meetings of both Interscholastic and College Coaches Association, were held. All of the recommendations, on rule changes and additions, which were received and correlated by Howard Stepp, of Princeton, a member of

the Swimming Rules Committee, were discussed and acted upon at these rules committee meetings.

Each year the College Coaches Association donates an award to worthy swimmer, which, in the minds of the committees in charge, best represents the ideal in leadership, ability and character. The prize is a properly inscribed wrist watch. The winner for 1949 was Wally Ris of Iowa University and the presentation was made by Karl Michael, Dartmouth, Chairman of the College Coaches Awards Committee.

The University of North Carolina, and Mr. R. A. Fetzer, Director of Athletics, Ralph Casey, Prof. Cornwell, Dick Jamerson, and all of their able assistants did a remarkably fine job in getting everything ready for this great meet. Their hospitality was unsurpassed and their patience and fortitude were superb. Their audiences were cooperative and generous with their applause and nothing more could be asked in this the first trek South for an N.C.A.A. Swimming Championship. On behalf of the Swimming Rules Committee, I wish to thank everybody for this great help. Without it nothing worth while could be accomplished.

Team Scoring

Ohio State	49	Michigan St.	10	Washington	4
Iowa	35	Northwestern	10	Harvard	3
Michigan	32	North Carolina	7	Fenn College	2
Yale	18	Rutgers	6	Texas	2
LaSalle	12	So. Calif.	6	Cincinnati	2
Purdue	11	Dartmouth	4	Duke Univ.	2
		Stanford	4	Iowa State	1

Meet Results

1500-meter free style: 1) W. Heusner, Northwestern; 2) R. Sala, Stanford; 3) F. Norris, Harvard; 4) Estoclet, Yale; 5) R. Watts, Iowa State; 6) J. Thomas, No. Carolina. Time: 19:04.8 (New Pool Record).

50-yard free style: 1) R. Weinberg, Michigan; 2) H. Patton, Michigan State; 3) Reid, Yale; 4) R. Bushey, Fenn; 5) Nugent, Rutgers; 6) Thomas, Purdue. Time: 23.1.

150-yard backstroke: 1) R. DeGroot, Ohio State; 2) J. Thomas, North Carolina; 3) D. Draves, Iowa; 4) R. Knight, Ohio State; 5) D. Korten, Michigan State; 6) H. Patterson, Michigan State. Time: 1:34.0 (New pool record).

220-yard free style: 1) W. Smith, Ohio State; 2) R. Wolfe, So. California; 3) M. Mann, Michigan; 4) E. Gilbert, Texas; 5) Blum, Yale; 6) G. Hoogerhyde, Michigan State. Time: 2:08.5 (New meet and pool record).

300-yard Medley relay: 1) Iowa (Draves, Stassforth, Straub); 2) Ohio State (DeGroot, Bartels, Smith); 3) Michigan (Kahn, Sohl, Kogen); 4) Washington (Campbell, Heaney, Salmon); 5) Yale (Ratkiewich, Girdes, Baribault); 6) Texas (Karbach, Cone, Gilbert). Time: 2:54.1 (New pool record).

440-yard free style: 1) W. Smith, Ohio State; 2) W. Huesner, Northwestern; 3) J. Thomas, No. Carolina; 4) R. Wolfe, So. California;

5) M. Mann, Michigan; 6) E. Gilbert, Texas. Time: 4:42.6 (New pool record).
 100-yard free style: 1) W. Ris, Iowa; 2) R. Weinberg, Michigan; 3) McIntyre, Dartmouth; 4) G. Hoogerhyde, Michigan State; 5) Nugent, Rutgers; 6) Reid, Yale. Time: 50.4 (New pool record).
 200-yard breast stroke: 1) K. Carter, Purdue; 2) J. Verdeur, La Salle; 3) D. Seibold, Michigan State; 4) Stassforth, Iowa; 5) Bruch, Dartmouth; 6) R. Sohl, Michigan. Time: 2:14.8 (New pool record).
 400-yard free style relay: 1) Yale (Girdes, Farnsworth, Munson, Reid); 2) Michigan (Kogen, Mann, Moss, Weinberg); 3) Iowa (Busch, Garat, Straub, Ris); 4) Rutgers (Irwin, McNeil, Schlangen, Nugent); 5) LaSalle (Rhodes, Devlin, Regan, Verdeur); 6) North Carolina (Drew, Norwood, Twining, Osborne). Time: 3:27.0 (New Meet and Pool Record).
 150-yard individual medley: 1) J. Verdeur, LaSalle; 2) K. Carter, Purdue; 3) Moss, Michigan; 4) Stickney, Cincinnati; 5) D. Draves, Iowa; 6) R. White, Indiana. Time: 1:30.8 (New American, Collegiate, Meet and Pool Record).
 Low board diving: 1) B. Harlan, Ohio State; 2) D. Brockway, Iowa; 3) H. Billingsley, Ohio State; 4) Conner, Duke; 5) Trimborn, Michigan; 6) J. Calhoun, Ohio State. Points: 142.41.
 High board diving: 1) B. Harlan, Ohio State; 2) J. Calhoun, Ohio State; 3) Brockway, Iowa; 4) Simpson, Ohio State; 5) Hubley, Purdue; 6) Hadlick, Yale. Points: 152.37.

EDWARD T. KENNEDY, Columbia University,
Chairman, Rules Committee

TENNIS

THE 1949 N.C.A.A. Tennis Championships were held at the University of Texas, Austin, Texas, June 20-25, 1949. The tournament was under the capable direction of Dr. D. A. Penick, a member of the N.C.A.A. Tennis Committee. Mr. Wilbur Allison acted as official referee, and Mr. Dana X. Bible as tournament chairman.

There was a total of 76 singles players and 32 doubles teams participating, representing 35 universities. The drawings were made on the Saturday prior to the first day of the tournament. The matches progressed normally throughout the week on the clay courts of the University of Texas. On Tuesday evening at Hill Hall an excellent dinner was given for all players and coaches. Speeches by members of the N.C.A.A. Tennis Committee, the president of the University of Texas and Mr. Dana X. Bible, Director of Athletics, were featured.

The tournament grossed \$2,391.69; the expense totaled \$3,056.95, leaving a deficit of \$665.26 which was assumed by the University of Texas. The university re-surfaced its courts and provided new canvas for background which contributed materially to the fine conditions that existed throughout the week. Brochures were sent to all Directors of Athletics and tennis coaches well in advance of the tournament. Entrants were well-housed in Hill Hall on the university campus.

On the final day, June 25, Sammy Match of the San Francisco University met Jack Tuero from Tulane University for the singles title. After this match, the doubles title was played off between Sammy Match and Art Larsen from San Francisco University and James Brink and Fred Fisher of the University of Washington. At the conclusion of these two final events the N.C.A.A. medals and appropriate prizes were presented to the winners of the singles and doubles matches. The team championship and the Garland Bowl were won by the University of San Francisco.

The University of Texas will again act as official host for the 1950 Championships.

On behalf of the N.C.A.A. Tennis Committee I wish to thank the University of Texas for its splendid hospitality and to pay special tribute to their representative Dr. D. A. Penick who very efficiently handled the tournament.

The results of the singles and doubles starting with a round of eight, and the summary of the Garland Bowl points and team championship scores follow:

SINGLES

Quarter-Finals

Fred Kovaleski (William and Mary) defeated Gene Garrett (U.C.L.A.), 6-4, 6-4

Sam Match (San Francisco) defeated Gardner Larned (Rollins) 6-3, 6-0

Buddy Behrens (Rollins) defeated Herb Flam (U.C.L.A.), 5-7, 6-1, 6-3

Jack Tuero (Tulane) defeated Art Larsen (San Francisco), 8-6, 6-4

Semi-Finals

Sam Match defeated Fred Kovaleski, 6-2, 2-6, 6-0, 6-3

Jack Tuero defeated Buddy Behrens, 6-1, 6-4, 6-2

Finals

Jack Tuero defeated Sam Match, 2-6, 0-6, 6-4, 9-7, 6-0

DOUBLES

Quarter-Finals

Harris-Turpin (Rice) defeated Flam-Garrett (U.C.L.A.), 6-4, 6-3

Match-Larsen (San Francisco) defeated Kovaleski-Atwater (William and Mary), 6-3, 14-12

Brink-Fisher (Washington) defeated Larned-Behrens (Rollins), 7-5, 6-4

Kelley-Goldfarb (Texas) defeated Seixas-Taylor (North Carolina), 9-7, 6-3

Semi-Finals

Match-Larsen defeated Harris-Turpin, 6-3, 11-13, 6-4, 6-3

Brink-Fisher defeated Kelley-Goldfarb, 6-2, 6-2, 6-4

Finals

Brink-Fisher defeated Match-Larsen, 4-6, 6-3, 6-3, 6-3

TEAM SCORING

University of San Francisco ..	7	William and Mary	3
Rollins College	4	University of Texas	2
University of Washington ..	4	Rice Institute	2
Tulane University	4	University of North Carolina..	1
U. C. L. A.	3		

GARLAND BOWL

Point score for the Garland Bowl follows:

	Singles	Doubles	Total 1949	Total '42-'49
William and Mary	1	0	1	15
Southern California	0	0	0	12
Miami University	0	0	0	12
Stanford	0	0	0	11
University of Texas	0	1	1	9
San Francisco University	2	2	4	9
Rice Institute	0	1	1	6
Notre Dame	0	0	0	5
Tulane	3	0	3	5
California	0	0	0	4
U. S. Military Academy	0	0	0	4
U. C. L. A.	0	0	0	4
North Carolina	0	0	0	4
University of Washington	0	3	3	4
Georgia Tech	0	0	0	2
George Pepperdine	0	0	0	2
Calif. Inst. of Tech	0	0	0	1
Gonzaga	0	0	0	1
Rollins College	1	0	1	1
Utah	0	0	0	1

(San Francisco gained one-year possession of the Garland Bowl by scoring more points (4) toward that award than any other school.)

RANKINGS

Following are the 1949 National Rankings:

Singles

1. Jack Tuero
2. Sam Match
3. Fred Kovaleski
4. Buddy Behrens
5. Art Larsen
6. Gene Garrett
7. Herb Flam
8. Gardner Larned
9. Dick Savitt

Doubles

1. Brink and Fisher
2. Match and Larsen
3. Larned and Behrens
4. Kelley and Goldfarb
5. Harris and Turpin
6. Kovaleski and Atwater
7. Seixas and Taylor
8. Flam and Garrett

WILLIAM C. ACKERMAN, U. C. L. A.,
Chairman, Tournament Committee

TRACK AND FIELD

THE annual meeting of the N.C.A.A. Track and Field Rules Committee was held in Los Angeles, June 15, 16, 17, 1949. All members were present. Each rule was discussed and a number of clarifications and suggestions made. The following major rules changes were made and will appear in the 1950 N.C.A.A. Track and Field Guide.

Rule 3. Suggested improvement in wind gauges.

Rule 21. "When starting blocks are available, no holes shall be dug."

Rule 27. "In the broad jump, shot, discus, javelin, and hammer, the four preliminary trials shall be in pairs in the order in which contestants are listed for competition."

Rule 29. "For high school competition the low hurdle race shall be over 8 hurdles. The distance shall be 180 yards with 20 yards from the start to the first hurdle, 20 yards between each two hurdles, and 20 yards from the last hurdle to the finish." (Approved by National High School Federation)

Rule 30. "A wooden or metal box shall be used for the planting pit."

ANNUAL MEET

THE University of Southern California was host to the visiting athletes, June 17 and 18, and under the able direction of W. O. Hunter, promoted one of the most successful of the many colorful N.C.A.A. Championships. A new championship record in the shot put, 56' 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ ", was made by Fuchs of Yale. Records equalled were: 120-yard high hurdles: 13.9 by Dixon, U.C.L.A.; 100-yard dash: 20.4 by Patton, U.S.C.; and 880-yard run: 1:50.3 by Whitfield, Ohio State. Doubles were scored by Patton, U.S.C., in the 100 and 220, and by Dixon, U.C.L.A., in the high and low hurdles. The meet was won by the University of Southern California with 55 2/5 points. U.C.L.A. was second with 31, Stanford third with 30, and Michigan State fourth with 26. Net profits from the meet were sufficient to pro-rate standard railroad fare and pullman fares to all point winners.

An All-America Track and Field Team was selected by the Committee at a special meeting following the championships. Three men were selected for each event. This team will be featured in the 1950 Track and Field Guide.

Team Scoring

S. California	.55 2/5	Brown	10	Villanova	4
U. C. L. A.	31	Santa Barbara	9		Arizona St.	2
Stanford	30	Denver	8		Brigham Young	2
Michigan St.	26	Michigan	8		Haverford	2
Penn St.	25	Minnesota	8		Washington St.	2
Seton Hall	23	Rhode Is. St.	7 2/5		Oregon	1 2/5
N. Y. U.	23	Oklahoma	7		Col. of Pacific	1 2/5
Yale	22	Indiana	7		Auburn	1
Wisconsin	22	Rice	7		Bradley	1
Ohio St.	16	California	6		Temple	1
Tulane	10	Princeton	6		Illinois	1
San Diego	10	Utah St.	6		Georgetown	1
Missouri	10	San Jose	5 2/5		Colorado	1
Cornell	10	Kansas	4		Occidental	1

Meet Results

100-yard dash: 1) M. Patton, S. California (9.7); 2) A. Stanfield, Seton Hall (9.8); 3) B. Work, UCLA. (9.9); 4) P. Bienz, Tulane (10.0); 5) B. Crowe, San Jose (10.0); 6) C. Peters, Indiana (10.0).

220-yard dash: 1) M. Patton, S. California (20.4); 2) A. Stanfield, Seton Hall (20.5); 3) P. Bienz, Tulane (20.9); 4) C. Peters, Indiana (21.0); 5) G. Bryan, Stanford (21.3); 6) W. Lancaster, Penn State (21.4).

440-yard dash: 1) C. Moore, Cornell (47.0); 2) R. Pearman, N.Y.U. (47.1); 3) F. Fox, Seton Hall (47.4); 4) W. De Loach, S. California (47.4); 5) L. Hoff, Stanford (47.4); 6) B. Parker, Occidental (47.5).

880-yard run: 1) M. Whitfield, Ohio State (1:50.3); 2) H. Barten, Michigan (1:50.4); 3) B. Pruitt, S. California (1:50.8); 4) P. Bowers, Kansas (1:51.1); 5) J. Grosholz, Haverford (1:51.2); 6) P. Thigpen, Seton Hall (1:51.3).

One-mile run: 1) D. Gehrman, Wisconsin (4:09.6); 2) B. McGuire, Missouri (4:12.0); 3) R. Wittreich, Princeton (4:14.0); 4) B. Ross, Villanova (4:14.1); 5) C. Robison, Brigham Young (4:14.8); 6) F. Owens, Indiana (4:15.95).

Two-mile run: 1) H. Ashenfelter, Penn State (9:03.9); 2) W. Dreutzer, Michigan State (9:08.9); 3) B. Black, Rhode Island State (9:10.5); 4) J. Urquhart, Wisconsin (9:11.7); 5) D. Paeth, Washington State (9:15.2); 6) B. Overton, Auburn (9:21.5).

120-yard high hurdles: 1) C. Dixon, U.C.L.A. (13.9); 2) D. Attlesey, S. California (14.1); 3) J. Gehrdes, Penn State (14.2); 4) P. Christiansen, Michigan State (14.3); 5) D. McKee, Stanford (14.35); 6) B. Mitchell, Georgetown (14.5).

220-yard low hurdles: 1) C. Dixon, U.C.L.A. (22.7); 2) J. Gehrdes, Penn State (22.7); 3) R. Frazier, S. California (23.1); 4) H. Smith, Michigan State (23.3); 5) D. Ault, Missouri (23.4); 6) B. Garrett, Indiana (23.4).

High jump: 1) D. Phillips, Brown (6' 7"); 2) Tied: I. Mondschein, N.Y.U., and V. McGrew, Rice (6' 6"); 4) Tied: G. Stanich, UCLA; D. Eddleman, Illinois; W. Dancer, Santa Barbara; D. Lyster, Temple; J. Heintzman, Bradley; M. Martin, San Jose; J. Barnes, S. California (6' 4").

Pole Vault: 1) B. Smith, San Diego (14' 3"); 2) Tied: B. Carroll, Oklahoma and T. Bennett, Wisconsin (14'); 4) Tied: R. Kring, Col. of Pacific; G. Rasmussen, Oregon; J. Montgomery, S. California; A. Sherman, Rhode Island State; G. Mattos, San Jose (13' 8").

Broad jump: 1) F. Johnson, Michigan State (25' 2½"); 2) J. Biffle, Denver (24' 3¼"); 3) H. Aihara, S. California (24' ¼"); 4) G. Bryan, Stanford (23' 11"); 5) R. Grant, California (23' 3"); 6) G. Kailas, Wisconsin (22' 11").

Shot put: 1) J. Fuchs, Yale (56' 1½"); 2) S. Lampert, N. Y. U. (55' 2¼"); 3) O. Chandler, Stanford (54' 11½"); 4) L. Davis, Stanford (54' 4½"); 5) B. Bayless, S. California (53' 4½"); 6) J. Swope, S. California (52' 9½").

Discus throw: 1) V. Frank, Yale (168' 9½"); 2) B. Thompson, Minnesota (166' 2½"); 3) B. Miller, Ohio State (161' 6½"); 4) T. Lewis, U.C.L.A. (160' 9¾"); 5) J. Fuchs, Yale (159' 6¾"); 6) W. Linn, San Jose (158' 7½").

Javelin throw: 1) B. Held, Stanford (224' 8¼"); 2) D. Pickarts, Santa Barbara (221' 10½"); 3) R. Roylance, Utah State (216' 1¾"); 4) G. Roseme, California (204' 2½"); 5) B. Miller, Arizona State (201' 11¾"); 6) J. Todd, Colorado (201' 7").

CROSS COUNTRY

The 11th annual Cross Country championship was held at Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich., on Monday, November 28, 1949. The weather was cold (35 degrees) and windy. A heavy snowfall preceded the meet and Michigan State did a fine job in cleaning off the course in the best possible manner. Footing was generally good. Robert Black of Rhode Island State won his second straight N.C.A.A.

crown in 20:25.7 over the four-mile course, considerably off the record he set a year ago of 19:52.3. Michigan State's Spartans captured their second successive team championship.

Place	Name	Team	Official Time	Team Place
1	Robert Black	Rhode Island '50	20:25.7	
2	Donald A. Gehrman	Wisconsin '50	20:31.0	1
3	William G. Mack	Michigan State '50	20:35.0	2
4	William Lucas	Manhattan '52	20:40.0	3
5	Richard Church	Syracuse '50	20:42.0	4
6	Neil Pratt	Syracuse '51	20:42.5	5
7	Donald L. Makielski	Michigan State '51	20:47.0	6
8	Robert Rodibaugh	Purdue '51	20:47.5	7
9	Richard Lewandowski	Army '50	20:48.0	8
10	Warren O. Druetzler	Michigan State '51	20:50.0	9
11	Dick Kilty	Minnesota '50	20:53.0	
12	Fred Schoeffler	Tufts '50	20:55.0	
13	Donald Ashenfelter	Penn State '51	20:55.5	10
14	Robert Freebairn	Penn State '51	20:57.0	11
15	Victor L. Twomey	Illinois '50	20:59.0	12
16	Albert R. Porto	Penn State '51	21:04.0	13
17	Robert Karnes	Kansas '50	21:08.0	14
18	Jack Dianetti	Michigan State '50	21:10.0	15
19	Richard Shea	Army '52	21:13.0	16
20	Herb Semper	Kansas '52	21:15.0	17

Team Scoring

1. Michigan State	2-6-9-15-27-(38)-(44)	59
2. Syracuse	4-5-20-21-31-(42)-(43)	81
3. Manhattan	3-18-19-22-23-(39)-(76)	85
4. Penn State	10-11-13-29-30-(34)-(41)	93
5. Army	8-16-26-32-51-(52)-(78)	133
6. Kansas	14-17-28-33-54	146
7. Wisconsin	1-40-47-56-63-(75)	207
8. Illinois	12-48-49-58-77	244
9. Purdue	7-50-53-72-73-(90)-(99)	255
10. Notre Dame	25-37-65-68-70-(96)-(98)	265
11. Wayne	36-46-55-57-85-(109)-(111)	279
12. Miami	24-60-61-66-71-(81)-(102)	282
13. Wheaton	35-59-64-74-92-(95)	324
14. Oberlin	45-69-83-93-101-(107)-(114)	391
15. Michigan Normal	79-80-86-91-105-(112)	441
16. Central Michigan	62-84-100-103-104-(116)	453
17. Cornell College	67-88-89-94-106-(113)-(115)	464
18. Bowling Green	82-87-97-108-110	484

WILBUR H. HUTSELL, Alabama Polytechnic Institute,
Chairman, Rules Committee

WRESTLING

THE 19th Annual Team and Individual Wrestling Championships of the National Collegiate Athletic Association were held at the Men's Gym, Colorado A & M College, Fort Collins, Colorado, March 25th and 26th, 1949.

The hospitality and the entertainment for the contestants and coaches reached a new high this year. The entire staff

is to be congratulated on the efficient planning and carrying out of all arrangements for the tournament. Each contestant was furnished an individual locker; the facilities, etc., were so well planned that there wasn't any confusion at any time. It was a pleasure to have been a part of the meet.

Colorado A & M introduced an innovation at this tournament that I hope will be continued. Three matches were run at one time with three scoreboards running at the same time so that it was possible to look at the score board and know how each individual match was going at any time.

By holding the tournament at Colorado A & M it made it possible for a few of the Pacific Coast teams to be there, and we hope they will be with us again next year. A large number of the Pacific Coast coaches were present. The tournament was well attended and interest in wrestling is gaining steadily in the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Coast areas.

The number of contestants participating was 118; the number of schools participating was 34, as against 98 contestants last year and 29 schools. This shows a noteworthy gain. The matches were well contested; in fact they were on a higher plane than at any time since the war. At every session of the tournament you could find exciting matches. The competition was quite even and rugged.

Every section of the country had outstanding wrestlers at the tournament.

Charles Hetrick of Oklahoma A & M was selected as the outstanding wrestler of the tournament. Hetrick, a former Marine veteran of the Pacific who made many landings, was cool, clever and perfectly conditioned. Competition in his weight as in all of them was terrific. Charles Hetrick beat Leo Thomsen of Cornell, a former member of the Olympic Team, and Russell Bush of Iowa State Teachers, a former National Champion, the same day.

Oklahoma A & M won the team trophy again with 32 points and Iowa State Teachers was a fairly close second with 27 points. Cornell College of Mount Vernon, Iowa, was third with 22 points.

The Wrestling Coaches and Officials Association met under William Sheridan of Lehigh High School, and the following officers were elected: President, Julius F. Wagner, Colorado A. & M. College; Vice-President, Dave McCuskey, Iowa State Teachers College; Secretary-Treasurer, D. C. Bartelma, University of Minnesota; Membership Secretary, Arnold W. Umbach, Alabama Politechnic Institute.

Team Scoring

Oklahoma A. & M.	32	Iowa	5	Indiana	1
Iowa St. Tchrs.	27	Syracuse	4	Ithaca College	1
Cornell College	22	Colorado A. & M.	3	Wheaton College	1
Michigan State	13	Illinois	3	Iowa State	1
Minnesota	11	Navy	2	Utah State	1
Purdue	9	Penn State	2	Kansas State	1
Nebraska	5				

Individual Place Winners

Division	Champion	Second	Third	Fourth
121 lb.....	Plaza (Purdue)	Penninger (Okla. A&M)	Hauser (Cornell Col.)	Lappin (Minn. U.)
128 lb.....	Hetrick (Okla. A&M)	Thomsen (Cornell Col.)	Bush (Ia. St. T. C.)	*Rice (Minn. U.)
136 lb.....	Lange (Cornell Col.)	Dickenson (Mich. State)	Klar (Ia. St. T. C.)	Meeker (Okla. A&M)
145 lb.....	Young (Ia. St. T. C.)	Anderson (Mich. State)	Lange (Cornell Col.)	George (Okla. A&M)
155 lb.....	Nelson (Ia. St. T. C.)	Hunte (Syracuse U.)	Mullison (Colo. A&M)	Snook (Cornell Col.)
165 lb.....	Smith (Ia. St. T. C.)	Flessner (Okla. A&M)	Gaumer (Illinois U.)	Lyons (Kans. St. C.)
175 lb.....	Gregson (Okla. A&M)	Scarpello (Iowa U.)	Reese (Nebraska)	VanCott (Purdue U.)
Hvywt.....	Gagne (Minn. U.)	Hutton (Okla. A&M)	Maldegan (Mich. State)	Barr (Penn. State)

*Shortest match: Rice, Minnesota, pinned Kelly, Wyoming, 38 seconds.
(This also Tournament's fastest fall).

B. R. PATTERSON, University of Nebraska,
Chairman, Rules Committee

MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND COUNCIL

Executive Committee at Evanston, Illinois

June 8-9-10, 1949

1. Voted that the Committee approve the report of Basketball Tournament Chairman Arthur C. Lonborg which stated that the 1949 tournament of the Association had grossed \$75,513.09 and netted \$60,848.92 prior to the distribution to the competing teams. As per the prescribed formula, \$30,424.46 was distributed to the eight competing teams.

2. Voted that the Association subscribe a sufficient amount of money to the National Association of Basketball Coaches to underwrite the cost of publishing the N.A.B.C. Bulletin and that action on other N.A.B.C. financial requests be postponed until the Association has considered other financial obligations.

3. Clarence P. Houston, chairman of the Constitutional Compliance Committee, reported to the Executive Committee the status of his Committee's operations. Mr. Houston dealt at length with the work of his committee and the general situation relative to enforcement of the Sanity Code. Among other things, he stated: (a) as of June 1, 1949, 16 member institutions were known to be not in compliance with the Code; (b) 12 institutions were considered "pending," having submitted evidence to the Committee of their intent to comply, and (c) 11 institutions were classed as doubtful but that no final disposition could be made of their cases until further information had been obtained; (d) one of the most encouraging aspects was the fact that many Presidents had shown keen interest in the success of the code.

4. Voted that the President appoint a Committee to study the problems of membership as well as the scope of the Association's statistical service and that this Committee report recommendations to the Executive Committee. (The President appointed Reaves Peters, Hugh C. Willett, and K. L. Wilson to the Committee.)

5. Voted that the following N.C.A.A. Bowl Games Committee be appointed for 1949:

Horace Renegar,
Tulane University
Bernie H. Moore,
Southeastern Conference
Robert J. Kane,
Cornell University
W. W. Kraft,
University of Oklahoma
Victor O. Schmidt, Pacific Coast Conference (Chairman)

William D. Murray,
University of Delaware
Edmund M. Cameron,
Duke University
C. E. Southern,
University of Arizona
Jess Neeley,
Rice Institute
Victor O. Schmidt, Pacific Coast Conference (Chairman)

6. Voted that the President appoint a Committee to study the Association's financial position and to recommend to the Executive Committee a plan for operating a separate office, the operation of which would be financed entirely by dues. Other activities of the Association would be financed by other revenue under such an arrangement.

7. Voted that the Association appropriate \$5,000.00 for use by the Constitutional Compliance Committee, it being understood that additional funds shall be available if needed.

8. Voted that an organizational committee be appointed to enlarge and redefine the duties of the present Publications Committee and that said organizational committee and the officers of the Association be authorized to proceed with plans for the N.C.A.B. to publish the Guides, making use of the funds of the Association for that purpose.

9. Voted that the Executive Committee approve the request of membership transfer of Idaho College from the Eighth to Seventh District and Georgetown University from the Third to Second District.

10. Voted that no action be taken concerning the voting powers of the member-at-large on the National Basketball Committee.

11. Voted that the following Committee on Committees and Nominating Committee be approved:

Committee on Committees

1st District	William H. McCarter, Dartmouth College
2nd District	E. LeRoy Mercer, University of Pennsylvania
3rd District	Robert A. Fetzer, University of North Carolina
4th District	Richard C. Larkins, Ohio State University
5th District	Reaves E. Peters, Missouri Valley Intercol. A. A.
6th District	Howard Grubbs, Texas Christian University
7th District	Ike J. Armstrong, University of Utah
8th District	Stanley B. Freeborn, University of California
Chairman	Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California

Nominating Committee

1st District	Edward S. Parsons, Northeastern University
2nd District	Robert J. Kane, Cornell University
3rd District	Geary Eppley, University of Maryland
4th District	J. H. Nichols, Oberlin College
5th District	George D. Small, University of Tulsa
6th District	Edwin D. Mouzon, Southern Methodist University
7th District	E. L. Romney, Mountain States Conference
8th District	Willis O. Hunter, University of Southern California
Chairman	N. W. Dougherty, University of Tennessee

12. Voted to establish a \$3.00 registration fee for delegates to the Association's annual Convention.

Executive Committee at New York

January 10-11-12, 1950

1. Voted to confirm the action taken by mail vote in approving the arrangements Secretary-Treasurer K. L. Wilson

had made with the Northern Trust Company, Chicago, in establishing a "line of credit" in connection with the N.C.A.B.'s publication of the Official Guides of the Association.

2. Voted that the Publication Committee be increased to a membership of three, each member to be appointed to a four-year term on a rotating basis, and that the Committee be assigned jurisdiction over matters of general policies and procedure in the publication of the Guides.

3. Voted that the Executive Committee approve the recommendation that there be a 50% increase in institutional membership dues and that the necessary steps be taken to make this increase effective as of September, 1951.

4. Voted that the Executive Regulations of the Association be revised effective January 1, 1951, to require that institutions eligible for meets and tournaments of the Association be limited to active N.C.A.A. members.

5. Voted that the Executive Committee approve the plan for the 1950 N.C.A.A. baseball tournament, as presented by Frank G. McCormick, and that an appropriation to cover expenses of the Baseball Committee in connection with selection of a site and organization of the tournament be authorized, subject to the approval of the Secretary-Treasurer.

6. Voted that the President appoint a Committee to study possible revision of the Constitution and establishment of by-laws to the end that the machinery of the Association be made more effective.

Council at New York

January 12, 1950

Those in attendance were:

Lloyd Jordan,
Amherst College

Robert J. Kane,
Cornell University

Lloyd C. Emmons,
Michigan State College

C. E. Southern,
Arizona State College

Leo G. Provost,
University of Utah

Rev. John H. Murphy,
University of Notre Dame

Karl E. Leib,
President

J. H. Nichols,
Oberlin College
H. H. Caldwell,
U. S. Naval Academy
Emil L. Larson,
Border Conference
Alfred R. Masters,
Stanford University
Earle Davis
Kansas State College
K. L. Wilson,
Secretary-Treasurer
Walter Byers,
Executive Assistant

(Also attending the Council Meeting were all of the members of the Executive Committee and the Constitutional Compliance Committee of the Association.)

1. Clarence P. Houston, Chairman of the Constitutional Compliance Committee, reported to the Council the results of his Committee's activity during the year and stated that as a result of his Committee's activities seven member institutions of the Association had been found to be in non-compliance with the constitution of the Association.

Mr. Houston reported the evidence of non-compliance in the cases of the seven institutions involved: University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Virginia Military Institute, The Citadel, University of Maryland, Villanova College and Boston College.

2. The following representatives of the seven institutions appeared before the Council.

(a) Rev. Francis X. N. McGuire, Villanova College, who stated that his institution could revise its scholarship program to bring it into conformity with the Constitution. He explained that some 100 students held full sustaining scholarships of which 39 were football players.

(b) Colgate W. Darden, University of Virginia, who stated that Virginia was not in compliance and could not adjust its program to bring it into compliance under the existing language of the Constitution. It was President Darden's position that the Constitution should be revised so that the N.C.A.A. code would be more equitable for all members of the Association.

(c) Walter S. Newman, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, who stated that due to the military curriculum in effect at his institution it was impossible to meet the requirements of the N.C.A.A. He explained, for example, that the only "off hours" for students were between 4:00 and 5:30 p.m. on weekdays and four hours on Saturdays and as a result it was impossible for V.P.I. students to obtain jobs to aid in financing their college educations.

(d) Colonel William Couper and Colonel Frank L. Summers, Virginia Military Academy, who stated that on or after June 14, 1950, V.M.I. could be in compliance with the N.C.A.A. Constitution.

(e) Colonel D. S. McAlister, The Citadel, who stated that his institution had retained its membership in the Association in the hope that the inequities of the Constitution would be eliminated and that The Citadel then could comply with the requirements. He said that since there had been no revisions in the Constitution, The Citadel was resigning its membership with the understanding that when the institution feels it can comply with the Code it will request re-admittance.

(f) H. C. Byrd, University of Maryland, who stated that his institution was in compliance with the requirements of

the N.C.A.A. but that he had refrained from advising the Association of this fact until he could clarify certain aspects of the matter. Specifically, he asked how existing contractual arrangements would be regarded between a member institution and an institution found to be in non-compliance. President Byrd was advised that existing contractual arrangements would be honored.

(g) Rev. M. J. Dullea and John Curley, Boston College, who stated that Boston College's non-compliance had to do with two athletes and that his institution felt that the students in question were entitled to the aid they received on the basis of academic achievement.

3. Following the representatives' appearances, there was an extended discussion by the Council members. It was the sense of the meeting that none of the statements effected the Compliance Committee evidence that the seven institutions were not in compliance with the Constitution of the Association as of the established deadline for compliance of September 1, 1949.

4. Mr. Houston, as chairman of the Compliance Committee, stated that it was the recommendation of the Committee and of the Chairman of the Panel that the membership of the seven named institutions be terminated in conformance with the provisions of the Constitution of the Association.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, it was moved, that a motion be made at the Business Session of the Association, January 14, 1950, to terminate the membership of the seven named institutions which had failed to maintain athletic standards as of September 1, 1949, in accordance with the Constitution of the Association.

5. Voted that the Council accepts and approves the recommendation of the Constitutional Compliance Committee and the Chairman of the Panel and presents it to the Executive Committee for approval of the motion's presentation to the annual Business Session of the Association, January 14, 1950.

Executive Committee at New York

January 12, 1950

1. Voted that the Council, having accepted and approved a recommendation from the Constitutional Compliance Committee and the Chairman of the Panel to terminate the membership of seven institutions, and such recommendation having been presented to the Executive Committee for approval of its presentation on the floor of the Business Session of the Association, January 14, 1950, approval of the

Executive Committee is hereby given and it is directed that the Secretary hereby notify representatives of the seven named institutions.

2. Voted to approve the following dates and sites for 1950 meets and tournaments of the Association:

Ice Hockey — Colorado College, Colorado Springs, March 16-17-18.

Swimming — Ohio State University, Columbus, March 23-24-25.

Wrestling — Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, March 24-25.

Fencing — Wayne University, Detroit, Michigan, March 24-25.

Basketball — Western Playoffs, Kansas City, Mo., March 24-25.

Eastern Playoffs, New York City, March 23 and 25.

Finals, New York City, March 28.

Boxing — Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa., March 30-31, April 1.

Gymnastics — U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., April 1.

Track and Field — University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, June 16-17.

Tennis — University of Texas, Austin, June 19-24.

Golf — University of New Mexico, June 26-July 1.

Baseball — Omaha, Nebraska, June 15-22.

Cross Country — Michigan State College, E. Lansing, November 27.

3. Voted to establish a Credentials Committee of Robert A. Fetzer and Sam. B. Shirky.

4. Voted that contracts in existence as of the date of termination of membership of any N.C.A.A. member institution, having been established by reasonable evidence, may continue in full force and effect.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ANNUAL CONVENTION SECTION III

JOINT MEETING WITH AMERICAN FOOTBALL COACHES ASSOCIATION

Friday Morning, January 13, 1950

A joint meeting of the American Football Coaches Association with the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened at ten-thirty o'clock in the Grand Ballroom of the Hotel Commodore, New York, Mr. L. R. Meyer, President of the American Football Coaches Association, presiding.

PRESIDENT MEYER: At this time we are very happy to have the American Football Coaches Association join with the National Collegiate Athletic Association in an effort to divulge our ideas in regard to the two organizations. I hate to make this announcement, but General Eisenhower at the last moment was unable to attend this meeting. Naturally, we were all very desirous of having the General speak to us, but for some unknown reason, which has not been explained to me, or whatever the deal was, he could not appear. So I will proceed with the program.

At this time it gives me a great deal of pleasure to have the opportunity to come before these two organizations and express a few views that are in my heart. First in my mind is the lack of stability of the coaching profession. After each season men in the profession are forced to resign — after what is termed "an unsuccessful season." In a good many instances coaches who a few years ago were riding the crest of success and were hailed as the best in the business are now to be dismissed because of a few losses.

Why are these conditions existing? In my humble opinion, the executives and also the staunch supporters and alumni have been disappointed because their team was not good enough to be invited to participate in one of the major postseason affairs and bring glamor and riches to their institution. The result is to encourage proselytizing for better and richer material and to fire the coach. Personally, I feel that if each sport had a deadline as to when it is to cease playing, it would certainly help to eliminate these two evils. Furthermore, it would give each succeeding sport a fair chance to gain recognition and support, if desirous. My thought here is that every institution should think of a well-rounded athletic program instead of overemphasis on one and therefore neglect of the others.

Secondly, let us take into consideration the boys who are participating and representing our institutions in the respective sports. In many instances these boys are subjected to undue criticism by unscrupulous people due to their having bet on the game. It alarms me no little when cards are brought around every week, that professional odds-makers publish for the purpose of betting on games. It is my opinion that in most communities often gambling is unlawful, but the practice seems to go unnoticed. If any youngster makes a mistake on a given Saturday, the aforementioned gambler wants to scalp everyone connected with the organization. It is a problem that confronts most of us, and it is one of the evils that we should strive to erase.

After all, these boys are our kids, whether they are blood relations or not. They are put into our hands for direction and protection. Therefore, we coaches have an obligation to curtail the exploitation and evils that are now in evidence. I feel that everyone within the hearing of my voice should have in mind that he has an obligation to make good substantial citizens out of these youngsters. I am sure, with the foregoing facts in view, that every football coach in America wishes to preserve all the fine traits in the game. I cannot imagine anyone in the hearing of my voice who would want to deprive a young American boy of gaining an education and also the outstanding values that youth receives from the participation in sports. Furthermore, I am sure that the experience that boys have on an athletic field prepares them to meet their fellow man in after life as well as does any part of the educational structure.

With all these facts in view, I hope that we can devise a plan whereby the N.C.A.A. and the American Football Coaches Association will make a clear rule that provides for an athlete's maintenance to be governed by each institution's executives, not by a group of alumni and outsiders. May we all join together and come out of the huddle with the same signal.

It has been my privilege on numerous and sundry occasions to be with All-Star groups, where we have kids playing from all sections of the country, and furthermore, kids that represent your institution and mine. I have observed this one thing: that every kid, for instance in this recent East-West game—and here I might say that the East-West game is one of the fine contributions that men can make to football; when you go to that crippled children's hospital in San Francisco and see the great work they are doing in bringing back maimed youths to life again, you will join in my views along this line—these kids give their all, and, as I started to say, all the kids from all the institutions in this recent game that we had anything to do with were

great kids, fine American boys full of vim vigor, and they went out to San Francisco and participated in that game without a cent of remuneration. Generally, when you have that kind of kids, it makes you stop and think. Maybe we don't give the other fellow due consideration that we should. You know, on the other side of the line of scrimmage you will find just the same type of boy that you are coaching: a fine, clean, wholesome youth. I have yet to find a boy who has not been similar to my own. Why shouldn't we give the other fellow a lot of credit as we go along? Give him due credit. I have always tried, in my numerous public appearances, to educate the public to give credit to the other fellow when he makes a great play against you, and not to be too rabid in only one direction. I notice in football that when one of our kids makes a great run or does something exceptional in football, our supporters are ready to commend that individual for a great effort; on the other hand, when an opponent does a similar operation, our supporters are too ready to condemn our own kids for having been outmaneuvered, or for failure to tackle, or for failure to knock down the pass that was thrown for that particular operation. I feel that we have a definite problem in trying to educate, if possible, our supporters to give credit to the opponents when they are playing against us, and I just believe that it would make a much more wholesome proposition for all of us who are coaches, and faculty people as well, if the institutions tried to gain better relationships in this direction.

Another thought comes to me, and I know in our institution this is a true fact. Our faculty people and our athletic department are closely affiliated. The fact of the business is that I would hate to have any other way whereby I could not go and visit in the office of any faculty man on our campus and be greeted congenially. The same goes for them.

Gentlemen, when we get a little closer tie between the heads of all branches of our schools, I definitely feel that we shall have a much happier program. One of the greatest things that ever happened to me in my coaching life, which has not got too much further to go, was for the faculty to honor me at a dinner. Gentlemen, when you get that kind of connection, I think you are in a very fine position. When our faculty people will back us and we in turn will back them, I think that all of us will be much better off.

Gentlemen, I have enjoyed the honor of being the President of the American Football Coaches Association this year, and I sincerely hope that this Association will function and operate in the future as well if not better than in the past.

At this time I want to turn the program over to Dr. Leib, President of the N.C.A.A.

DR. LEIB: I know how disappointed you all are over the fact that General Eisenhower is not able to be with us this morning. For three years, this being the third, we have hoped that the General might be here, and he fully intended to be here. I have a little more information than was available at the time Dutch spoke to you. The General, up until last night, had fully intended to be with us this morning, and as late as last night was still engaged in preparing the speech that he intended to give you. An emergency has arisen which has made it necessary for him to cancel all engagements, including those at the University, and to devote his entire time for at least today and perhaps longer to other affairs than those connected with his University duties or with this meeting. That, I suppose, is one of the penalties we have to pay for attempting to take the time of a man who is so crowded with duties and so weighed down with responsibilities as General Eisenhower is at the present time. We are very sorry, all of us, that he cannot be here. I know that he regrets deeply that he is unable to be present. Perhaps at some future time he will.

I have been very much interested in what Dutch Meyer has had to say to you, and I am heartily in accord with practically everything that he has said. One point which made a special impression on me is the deplorable situation in which it becomes necessary for a coach to win the majority or all of his games in order to hold his job, and it is with a great deal of regret and some sadness that I see institutions of outstanding reputation allowing the heat to develop from their students and from their alumni to the point where a coach will be dismissed because of one or several losing seasons. No one knows better than the coaches and no one should know better than the faculty men that it is not only the coach that makes a winning season, but it is also the material with which he has to work, and also the breaks of the game. As Bob Zuppke has so often said, you never can tell which way a football is going to bounce. Someone called to my attention just yesterday the fact that in the Rose Bowl game this year, practically every score was the result of a break of one sort or another: a fumble, an attempt at a running kick that went wrong. Those breaks are impossible to predict. When they happen and an alert team takes advantage of them, that can be the football game very easily.

If the things which we have come to believe are true, if athletics is a part of a general educational program, if it

has values which make it worth while for reputable institutions of learning to carry on such programs, then certainly it is beneath the dignity of such institutions and not in accord with the general nature of their programs to put a coach into a position where he must win in order to hold his job. I hope that our faculty men and our administration officials will give more thought to their position in this respect and will have the courage to maintain the same high standard of ethics in their dealings with their coaches and with their athletic programs that they attempt to establish and maintain in connection with their educational work.

I think this morning it might be interesting if I were to give you something in the way of a very brief summary of our experience with the Code for the Conduct of Athletics as it exists at the present time. As you know, there is a great deal of difference of opinion in regard to various features of that Code. There is not so much difference of opinion and of fact in regard to some of its other features.

First of all, the conditions under which college athletics are carried on, and football in particular, because that is what we are most interested in, have changed considerably during the past ten years. Whereas formerly it was a very considerable experience, taking quite a lot of time, to go, let us say, from the campus of the University of Iowa to the campus of the University of Ohio, today it is possible to go from Chicago to the West Coast in seven hours' elapsed time and less than that in clock time. The Rose Bowl is nearer to the Middle West today than some of their own member institutions were fifteen years ago. It meant more time, more endurance, and more fatigue on the part of the teams to go from one edge of some of our conferences to the other than it does to go from the Middle West to the Pacific Coast or the East Coast at the present time. The progress in transportation has very largely changed the picture.

With that, we have had in increasing degree of competition among teams from different sections of the United States. The Middle West, the West Coast, the East Coast, the South — all of us are within practicable plane distance of one another at the present time, much nearer than we were a decade or so ago, and competition is increasing. It follows, then, that it becomes more and more desirable that there should be a uniform set of standards, a uniform set of rules, and a uniform set of officiating, having to do with the conduct of these games. Our rules are reasonably uniform. Our officiating is reasonably uniform. The conduct of athletics on the campuses of our various institutions still shows a considerable degree of difference, or has up

until the present time shown a considerable degree of difference.

In an attempt to bring about a more uniform situation as to the manner in which material is secured and as to the manner in which eligibility is maintained, the N.C.A.A. has taken up the task of trying to establish a uniform set of principles for the conduct of athletics. That set of principles represents the establishment of those basic considerations on which it was thought that it might be possible to bring about national agreement. In the enforcement of the rules, it is necessary to proceed slowly and to take a step at a time. To impose the penalties provided by the rules upon any member institution is a serious step, and consequently every opportunity possible must be given to make sure that the facts are adequately known at the time action is taken.

As a matter of practical operating procedure, the first clear-cut set of cases tending to arise is bound to be those in regard to which institutions say definitely, "We are not in accordance with the Code." Those are instances which are capable of definite termination. Although they have required a considerable degree of investigation, the sending out of questionnaires, the consideration of the replies, requests for further elucidation of conditions indicated by the replies, it is possible to get that work done first. After that, in successive stages, will come the cases of such institutions as are in violation of the Code who have not admitted or reported that they are not in conformance, and where it has been necessary, as a result of information brought before the officers in charge of the enforcement of the Code, to make investigations by sending an investigator, by having the chairman of the panel select a committee, visit the campus of the institution, and look into the actual conduct of affairs. That is a more time-consuming process. There are such investigations contemplated or under way at the present time; as the information is secured, gradually action will be proposed in those cases.

Furthermore, we come to an aspect of the Code in regard to which very little has been said. The provisions which it contains at the present time go quite a long way, but, as all of us know, they do not cover certain contingencies which will arise and which are thought to exist. We have been able to establish a very considerable degree of institutional responsibility. We have not as yet completely provided in the Code for those situations where a violation is not on the part of an institution but is on the part of individuals not directly connected with the institution, alumni supporters or outside groups.

We have not as yet come to complete agreement or set up what we feel to be satisfactory and final standards for the determination of the conduct of jobs for athletes. We have set down certain fundamentals, but it is going to be necessary in the future, as I think you all realize, to go further into this matter of standardizing job conditions and opportunities for work and go further in the control of activities on the part of outside individuals not connected with the institutions. That, of necessity, has to come more slowly. It is more complex; it takes more time; it is more difficult to handle. Consequently, a great part of that is material which will come up in the future.

If you say to me, "Is the Code working?" I have to say immediately, "What do you mean when you ask whether the Code is working?" If you mean "Has there been any improvement in conditions?" I can answer unqualifiedly that in my opinion there has been a very distinct improvement in conditions. For a long time there was a tendency in many institutions for the administrative officers of those institutions to shove off the whole problem of the conduct of inter-collegiate athletics and to build as nearly as might be a wall between themselves and it, so that they might say, "That is all in the hands of the directors of the place," or "That is all in the hands of the board in control of the place. They are responsible. If you have questions to ask, ask them. I have delegated that responsibility." That is a convenient position, I will admit, for the administrative officers of an institution, but one result of the Code has been to place back again upon the administrative officers — the Board of Regents or the Board of Visitors or the Board of Governors, or the President or the Faculty — to place back again upon the administrative officers a greater degree of responsibility for the conduct of athletics in their institutions than many of them had been exercising for some time. That responsibility is very definitely felt by the administrative heads of these institutions. When a president has to sign a statement that certain conditions exist in his institution, you can be very sure that he wants to be sure that what he is signing his name to is something that he can support, that he is making a statement of fact. In that respect, I think there has been distinct progress.

In addition to that, I believe there is a good degree of uniformity in many procedures throughout our country today, among our various institutions, more than there was before the passage of the Code. I think there is a deeper sense of responsibility. I think there is a more careful attempt at supervision. This is also important: I think there is a great deal more anxiety in regard to those borderline cases or

cases which may be over the borderline and which are actually known to be questionable. There is a great deal more responsibility. To that extent, I think the Code is working.

If you say to me, "Are there violations of the Code?" I cannot say that I know of positive violations, but upon the assertion of men in whose statements I have confidence, I have no doubt that there are a very great number of violations of the Code in existence at the present time. Not only that, I have no doubt that there will continue to be a very considerable number of violations of the Code over a very long time. That is nothing new in the field of attempts at regulation of human conduct. We have a great many laws that have been in existence for centuries which are still being violated and violated in a considerable number of instances. We have traffic laws which have materially improved the condition of traffic on our streets, and yet we have countless violations of those laws. Every time you attend a football game, you see the traffic laws being violated in instance after instance. Is that any argument for doing away with attempts at regulation? It takes time to get regulation established. It takes time to get attempts at regulation accepted. We cannot bring about changes by revolution as between today and tomorrow. These things have to grow slowly.

But there are already in existence, and observed, distinct changes for the better, and many of them — an increased sense of responsibility, an increased sense of anxiety in regard to violations. As it becomes established, if it does become established, that these rules are the rules to which a majority of institutions subscribe, and in terms of which they intend to conduct their affairs, there will be less difficulty and more acceptance as time goes on. Matters of application, details of operation, may have to be, and should be, changed from time to time, but if sound principles can be established and if those principles secure majority support and adherence, there will be an increasing and multiplying conformity to the principles to which a majority of our group are ready to subscribe.

The meeting which is to be held on Saturday is, in my opinion, one of the most important meetings in the history of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, or in the history of college athletics. At that time we are taking a step which I think can be well compared to the steps taken in the formation of our various conferences and especially in the meeting of presidents which led to the formation of the Western Conference and the operation of that conference over a period of a great many years. The occasion Saturday will be similar in importance, and it is going to deter-

mine in what direction our organized universities and colleges are going to go, and I think the time has come when we may as well stand up and be counted. I know what the attitude of a great many men is, and I appreciate and can honor the reasoning by which many of them have come to their conclusions, but in my opinion we cannot exist in a halfway position. You have to go predominantly in one direction or the other. Either we are going to have a set of principles to which the greater number of our members adhere, or else we might just as well say regulation is impossible, the sky is the limit, every institution will handle its affairs in its own way. If that happens, we are going to have a chaos in intercollegiate athletics which is beyond anything we have ever dreamed of. The outcome of that competition is going to be that there will be a few powerful organizations that will be in a position of superiority, with which no others will be able to compete. If it is simply a matter of which organization is most powerful and able to pay the highest prices, if we are going out into an open market for competitive bidding, I pity the schools that attempt to maintain a program on anything much above an intramural basis, unless they happen to be in a position to compete with the biggest, the most powerful, the most influential, the most adequately organized institutions.

A competition of that sort, in which the highest bidder wins out, is one which leads to, first of all, something approaching absolute chaos; also to a tradition which I doubt very much can be countenanced by a reputable educational institution. The result is bound to be, in my opinion, worse than anything we have ever seen.

I thank you.

ROUND TABLE MEETINGS

Friday Afternoon, January 13, 1950

A. LARGE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY GROUP

Chairman: KENNETH L. WILSON

CHAIRMAN WILSON: There probably is no more important matter to discuss than the impact of television on sports. The officers of the N.C.A.A. have fully realized this. We have had committees at work. A year ago the Association authorized \$5000 for a survey, which was presented at the last annual meeting in San Francisco.

On November 9th, this year, the Television Committee contacted a number of institutions selected from areas where there are a large number of television sets, and asked that they prepare a report. We also encouraged members in every section of the country, to make a survey and cooperate with our national questionnaire. So today we have several reports to be made. I think that following these reports a general discussion can be had. And if this group wishes to make a recommendation on policy, it can be submitted to the convention tomorrow.

It is unfortunate that we have so many important things to consider at the business meeting of the convention. But despite that fact, I think we must spend considerable time and thought on the subject of television and take any action thought to be beneficial to college athletics.

In the East, we have had a survey made by Mr. Jerry N. Jordan, of the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania, who began his research study on "The Effect of Television on Living Habits" in the Department of Psychology at Princeton University. His thesis on television won him membership in Sigma Xi, honorary society for original scientific research. He won Phi Beta Kappa and the Distinguished Military Student Award.

As a result of the need for additional work on the television problem, Jordan continued his work in the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Jordan should not be considered strictly as a young scientist. He won his letter three years as a member of the Princeton 150-pound football team, and was a voluntary coaching member of the Penn 150-pounders this past fall.

While his present survey is not concluded, the findings which he presents to you at this time are considered by some

as the most extensive and comprehensive yet developed. You can be the judge. So at this time I would like to present Mr. Jordan.

MR. JORDAN: First of all, I should like to tell you how this study got started and how it is being carried on now.

It began more than a year ago in the Department of Psychology at Princeton. Dr. William B. Michael worked with me in laying out a study of the long-range effect of television on family habits. This study, which was published last May, established one point which we considered very important. It showed clearly that television habits do change after people have had their sets for a year or more.

When they first get a set, it is an exciting new hobby. They stay at home more, and go out less to paid entertainment. But a year later, when the novelty has worn off, the original pattern tends to return. Attendance at some forms of outside entertainment even shows an increase.

This pattern is not new to American industry. It was true in radio's first effect on the sale of records, phonographs, musical instruments — even in attendance at movies and sporting events.

I felt that this Princeton study gave a sound basis for attempting to measure the long-range effect of television on sports attendance. Last summer it was started with the Philadelphia Athletics and Phillies, who have given wonderful cooperation, making possible surveys at the ball park, furnishing attendance figures and other information.

Later on, at a meeting with a number of Major and Minor League owners during the World Series, it was extended to include all sixteen of the Major League Baseball Clubs. Again, at the Minor League meeting in Baltimore it was further expanded to embrace the 444 Minor League Clubs.

When I entered the Graduate School at the University of Pennsylvania this fall, the Department of Athletics there cooperated in guiding and conducting the football study. As this work developed, more and more people have generously given their help. The United Press furnished their national attendance figures. The Sporting News gave us their records. All of the 88 Television Stations, The Atlantic Refining Company, the Sports Department of N. W. Ayer & Son have furnished helpful data. Recently, a number of individual colleges in the Association have added the benefit of their thoughts and experiences to date. All of these people cooperating together have made this a far more complete study than anyone alone could have done.

The study now includes attendance figures for 16 Major League Clubs, 444 Minor League Clubs, 127 Colleges and Universities, and 3 High School Areas, located in 522 cities

and towns in all parts of the United States. This data covers all 52 Television Areas and about 115 Non-Television Areas.

The public attitude survey now consists of 1200 personal interviews, 4000 mailed questionnaires, and 10,908 telephone interviews. We feel that the sample on actual attendance figures, as well as the public opinion surveys, is now big enough to give a reasonably dependable answer.

Now, I would like to tell you about the different steps in this study.

First of all, we had to recognize that no one factor alone affects attendance. You folks know even better than we do the importance of a winning or colorful team — a hot schedule — or economic conditions. If there has been any mistake in current studies of TV's effect on sports, it is probably due to the fact that television cannot be measured by itself as though it were the only thing that caused a rise or fall in attendance.

In all, there are fifteen different factors that had to be studied before we could get down to any sound attempt to measure the effect of television alone.

These factors include:

1. Personal Income or	11. Competition
2. Buying Power	12. Promotion
3. General Population and	13. Variations in Ticket Prices
4. College Population	14. AM Sportscasting
5. Unemployment	15. TV Sportscasting
6. Home and Visiting Team Performance	(a) On the Team Televised
7. Weather	(b) On other Teams, in a 50-Mile Radius
8. Kind of Games or Schedules	(c) Local versus Network Games
9. Individual Attractions	
10. Accommodations	

Those are the different attendance factors in the study. Many of these, such as income, population, and moving percentages, can be measured and correlated mathematically.

For others, such as promotion showmanship, and individual star attractions, all we can do is study them intensively and make the best possible estimate of their influence.

Obviously, any attempt to evaluate all of these factors would have been a hopeless task without the continuing interest, help, and cooperation of the experienced men and organizations mentioned earlier.

One of the first things learned was that each sport is a separate study in itself. Except for some broad, basic principles, the effect of various factors on baseball, for example, is different from the effect on football. It has not been possible to simplify this study by taking sports attendance as a whole. Each sport has had to be treated separately.

There are eleven major phases to the study. More than half have been completed. All will be done by April of this

year. So, while I cannot give you any conclusions at present, I do want to explain some of the steps and show you how they are being analyzed.

The first step is to make correlations on a national basis to determine the effect of national factors, like income, population and ticket prices on total attendance.

Here is one (Mr. Jordan used charts to illustrate his report.) that shows what has happened to paid admissions of all types of entertainment between 1929 and 1948.

Personal income has increased 250%; the amount of money spent on Paid Admissions has increased only 200%. It has not kept pace with the rapid rise in personal income.

Dollars spent on sports admissions, however, have more than kept pace. They have increased 440% — more than any other large field of entertainment, and much more than the rise in personal income. Movies have grown at a slower rate, and the theatre, opera, and similar forms have even declined below the 1929 level.

This is the division of the consumer's dollar spent on various types of sports in 1948. College football has become the top sport in the country in dollars spent on admission, representing 35% of the total. Professional baseball is next with 25%.

If we compare 1948 with the famous Golden Age of Sports" in 1929, we see that we are now in a sort of "Atomic Age of Sports."

All sports admissions, as you saw earlier, are up 440% against a personal income rise of 250%.

Racing, while still a small factor, has increased 1950%; Football is up 481%; Baseball is up 400%; Hockey, 266%, and other sports, 300%.

That is the condition in sports that we are now studying. It is interesting to look at just one of the curves that show the influence of different factors on attendance growth.

This chart shows disposable net income compared with dollars spent on admissions to college football and professional baseball. You can see that, except for the war years, the rank correlation between income and college football is very close — mathematically, about .98. In other words, when income falls, so does attendance, and vice versa.

You would expect that when disposable income declines, as it has done in 1949, the dollars spent on football admissions also would decline. However, that didn't happen. College football accomplished the unexpected by continuing to move ahead this year, when economic conditions suggested a halt or even a decline.

You may be interested to know that college football alone, of all major sports, has accomplished this — a truly remarkable job!

Our next step in the National Study has been to take 118 colleges and divide them into three groups:

1. The first group includes all that are televised.

2. The second group are those that are not televised, but which are within 50 miles of football games that are televised.

3. The third group includes those colleges not televised, and not within the range of any game, that is, either locally or by network.

The attendance trends in these three groups are then compared to give us our first and very general indication of the effect of television. This, alone, cannot be a specific answer because of the other factors that have to be analyzed.

Chart No. 9 shows you how we are approaching one of these other factors. There were 52 cities with 88 television stations operating on November 1st of last season. The saturation of television sets varied greatly between these areas, ranging from 24.2 in New York to 1.7 in Providence.

Naturally, television could not have the effect on attendance in Providence or San Francisco that it has in New York, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, or Chicago.

Even this saturation percentage, which is a very important factor in baseball, can be misleading in football, because your customers are not drawn from the general public as much as in baseball.

At Pennsylvania, for example, we have found that 40% of the regular season ticket buyers are television owners — nearly twice as high a saturation as the general public.

You cannot dismiss a town with a 5% saturation as negligible, because it is impossible that in an area like that, one-tenth of your best customers may have television sets.

Here is how we are putting these factors together for analysis.

The United Press national survey on attendance included colleges fairly well scattered in all parts of the country.

We have checked some of these figures directly and developed a preliminary list of 118 colleges typical of each section — large, medium, and small.

62 of these colleges are located in Television Areas; 57 are not.

This chart shows you the result when attendance is broken down on a per game basis so as to eliminate the inequalities due to a different number of games played each season.

In Non-TV Areas, 55% of the colleges showed an increase in 1949 over 1948.

In TV Areas, 50% increased. There isn't a significant difference in these two patterns.

However, if we break these figures down further, we find

that 46 colleges in areas of more than 5% TV saturation did not fare quite as well as the others. Only 43% of these colleges showed an increase; 57% decreased.

On the face of it, this suggests that a high saturation of television hurts attendance, but the problem cannot be simplified like that, because we still have 43% of the colleges that increased attendance under a high saturation of TV.

Now, before we reach any conclusion, we have to find out why some colleges increased and some decreased in this group. We have to examine what else was working to influence these things.

One important point in this connection is the record of football itself. 91% of the colleges, where we have been able to get figures for the past 20 years, have reached their all-time highs in attendance per game since the war; 38% reached their best records in 1949, a year when economic conditions declined.

We will come out of this national analysis with two fairly clear facts:

1. College football has made a remarkable record in attendance over the past four years — better than any other major sport — better than economic conditions would suggest.

2. Those colleges in TV Areas have shared in this record — but they have not done quite as well as the others.

The next step is to see if television is the cause, and how it may affect your future attendance. In order to do this, it was necessary to take one individual area for an intensive study of all the factors that affect attendance.

The area selected is the 50-mile radius of the City of Philadelphia.

The reasons for selecting Philadelphia are many:

1. To begin with, it has practically as high a saturation of sets as any area in the country — with TV conditions about the same as will exist in most cities two or three years from now. Nearly one out of every four families had a set in November, and there were three stations in operation, with overlaps from two others — in Wilmington and Lancaster.

2. Philadelphia has had sports television longer than any other place in the world. The first sports telecasts started at the University of Pennsylvania's football games in 1940, and, except for one war year, have continued for ten straight years. This provides an opportunity to measure the effect of TV by length of ownership, which we found was the most important factor in the Princeton Study. It is possible to get adequate samples of owners of two years or more in Philadelphia, one of the very few spots where this can be done now.

3. There are about 16 colleges playing football in this 50-mile area; some of national status and rating; others smaller but with strong local following. Thus, we have a good opportunity to measure the effect of TV on all types of games and on both large and small colleges.

4. Philadelphia Stations have carried football telecasting for one or more seasons on Pennsylvania, Temple, Villanova, and Catholic High School. They have also carried the network games coming in from the Middle West and New York, with special events such as the Army-Navy game, etc.

5. In addition, there has been a lot of sports telecasting of all types. The Phillies and the Athletics are entering their fourth year of television; the Philadelphia Eagles have televised home games one year and discontinued for one to get a comparison; the Philadelphia Warriors Basketball Team has done the same thing, and other sports, like College Basketball, Racing, Tennis, Boxing, Wrestling, etc., have all been strongly telecast. Station WFIL-TV, for example, had about 25% of its total programming during 1949 in sports.

These conditions make it possible to study the game-by-game effect of television in connection with such local factors as team performance, weather, kind of game, special attractions, ticket prices, AM and TV audiences.

We are doing this now in a variety of ways:

(a) The first is, naturally, a close attendance study correlated with team performance and other factors over a period of 25 years, in some cases, less in others.

(b) The next is a personal opinion study. There are 900 personal interviews in a random sample to determine the relative frequency of attendance and general attitude of TV and Non-TV Owners by economic strata, by location in city, suburban, or outlying areas, and length of ownership.

(c) We have also collected interviews at the baseball park, and measured the number of TV Owners and Non-TV Owners actually in the grandstands, boxes, and bleachers at different types of games.

(d) With the cooperation of the Athletics, the Phillies, and the University of Pennsylvania, more than 2000 letters were sent to season ticket buyers, divided into three groups: Those who bought season tickets in 1948 and repeated again this year. Those who bought in 1948, but did not repeat this year. Those who bought season tickets this year for the first time. All of these groups are being divided into TV Owners and Non-Owners and then subdivided by length of ownership — so as to show the effect of television on your best customers.

(e) Another 1800 questionnaires went to a random sample of Pennsylvania Alumni divided by graduating classes,

so we could make a comparison between the habits of TV and Non-TV Owners in different Age Groups.

(f) One other measurement is to find the relationship between the size of the television audience and the size of the crowd at the stadium. These figures are being analyzed to show whether or not the home audience increases in bad weather and how it varies for different types of games.

This study employs the standard Hooper and Pulse Audience Ratings, and a very intensive survey by The Atlantic Refining Company with 10,908 telephone calls in Philadelphia, Boston, Pittsburgh and Baltimore.

These last local studies are far from being finished and tabulated. I can tell you about only two of the several football studies that are now in process.

The first is one that I think will interest all of you. There is no indication that the televising of University of Pennsylvania games, or the Network Television, have hurt the attendance of other colleges in the Philadelphia area. Of 15 other colleges in that 50-mile radius, 8 of them have shown attendance increases; 6 decreases; and 1 remained the same.

The fear that television of a big college would hurt a small college does not seem to be substantiated. This fact is confirmed by our national figures. Small colleges showed a better attendance record than any other group of colleges in the country.

The second is the random sample of the general public. Here, you will see that the Philadelphia Area Study confirms the pattern found a year ago at Princeton.

People who have had their sets less than a year tend to stay home from football more than non-owners. After they have had their sets a year, this pattern begins to change.

Look how this interest builds up:

24% of owners of less than 3 months go out to football-games.

41% of owners of less than 1 year go out.

45% of owners of 1 to 2 years go to football games.

54% of owners of more than 2 years go.

If this pattern holds true when all the other studies are completed, it will give you a fairly reliable picture of what happens in a television area.

There is a decrease in attendance the first season people own their television sets.

However, when the next football season rolls around and people have had their sets a year, their attendance is just as good as that of non-owners. Two years later, their attendance is higher.

We have found that those persons who are very interested in sports were among the first to buy TV sets, so we cannot

jump to the conclusion that TV increases the attendance of these long-time owners.

It appears that (once the novelty has worn off) TV does not hurt attendance and may account for part of this increase.

It seems that if you are willing to accept the temporary loss in this group (short-term owners), in order to take advantage of the promotional opportunities offered by TV, you can help build for increases in the future. And you must remember that, year by year, the long-term owners group will increase and the short-term group will decrease.

However, we have not yet analyzed the pattern among season ticket buyers and alumni, both of which may be even more important to you than the general public. So any final conclusions are still premature.

We expect to know a great deal more by April, when all of these sections can be fitted into one pattern.

One last thing I would like to mention.

A study of this size develops a lot of things that may help football attendance in many places. We are tabulating all of the many suggestions made by both alumni and public.

For instance, there is a very strong request for an earlier starting time of football games in a number of places. Many people, especially in suburban areas, feel that a two o'clock start is too late.

There is an equally strong desire for Public Address explanation of penalties and unusual decisions on the playing field. Spectators want to know as much about such things as their friends may get over television at home.

Parking and traffic are quite a problem at many fields and these have a direct bearing on suburban area attendance.

Still another finding has been ways to use both regular broadcasting and TV to help promote attendance. There are some interesting facts on this subject that can prove of value in every area where radio and television are used.

I would like to show you just one chart on this subject, because it helps to explain what part TV can play in sports.

This is the story of what Television Owners were doing in New York on Saturday, November 5, 1949. That was a big TV Football Day. Four important games: Fordham-Army, Columbia-Dartmouth, Yale-Brown, and Wisconsin-Northwestern were all televised that afternoon in New York, but only 1 out of every 4 television sets was turned on, most of them to football.

What were the other 75% of the TV owners doing?

About 6 1/2% of these TV owners were listening to their radios for other games.

Nearly one-third were away from home—working, shopping, going to the movies, football games, and other things.

37.2% — the largest group of all — were at home, but doing something else; not looking at or listening to football.

There are some very interesting figures on this subject in the baseball section of this study. 25% of men in Philadelphia never have seen a professional baseball game in their lives; less than half of them see a game in any one season.

In football, only 45% of the men saw a game of any type last fall — high school, college, professional or even sand-lot.

Women, of course, show even lower attendance records. But I think you will be interested in this: In both the Baseball and Football Study, we have found that a higher percentage of women in TV families go out to the games than in Non-TV families.

In closing, I would like to thank you all very much for the privilege of speaking to you today, and ask you for any criticisms or suggestions that you may have. We have the attendance figures on all 460 baseball clubs. At the present time we have similar figures on only 127 colleges. If we could get more, the final conclusions would be of greater value and reliability.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Are there any questions that you would like to direct to Mr. Jordan at this time?

QUESTION: Can you give us some information on the impact of television on the high school situation attendance in Philadelphia?

MR. JORDAN: At the present time, I can't. That part of the study has not been analyzed yet, so that will have to wait until April.

QUESTION: That seems to be our big problem in North Jersey. The attendance falls as much as 50 per cent in most schools in the high school area.

MR. JORDAN: We will have figures on that, as I said. I don't have any conclusions yet. This is just an outline of what is being done. In April I think I will be able to give you a reasonable answer to that, but I am afraid I can't now.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I hope you will all give 100% cooperation in supplying information, because as I understand, Mr. Jordan is going to continue the study, and in April, I think it is, he plans to issue his findings.

The question also has been asked whether these talks will be sent to you. They will, so that you will have full benefit of the discussion.

Any other questions that you would like to ask Mr. Jordan? He has certainly spent a great deal of time and effort on this.

QUESTION: How will we be able to get a copy of that study when it is completed?

MR. JORDAN: I will be glad to send a copy to anybody who would like it. It is going to be published in Television

Magazine probably in May, and I will be glad to send out mimeographed copies of the results to anybody who would like them.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I want to thank you for coming in today, Mr. Jordan. We appreciate receiving the benefit of your fine study.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Gentlemen, we are happy to have here today representing the three big networks — the American Broadcasting Company, Columbia Broadcasting System, and the National Broadcasting Company — Mr. Joseph H. McConnell, President of N.B.C.

Mr. McConnell was asked to represent the networks by his associates because of a rather unusual background. He is familiar with the manufacturing end of the business, and now as President of N.B.C., he is in charge of both radio and television network broadcasting. Also, he was, at one time, a freshman football coach and business manager at the University of Virginia.

Mr. McConnell is a graduate of Davidson College in North Carolina. Later he received his degree in law at the University of Virginia.

It is a pleasure indeed at this time to introduce Mr. McConnell to you and to hear his remarks about television.

MR. McCONNELL: I am very appreciative indeed of the opportunity to speak to you for a short time this afternoon on behalf of the networks, both television and radio networks. As you see, I don't know whether I am well enough connected to speak before this organization. I look over the group here and I see Monty Younger who used to coach me at Davidson College, and he is now Director of Athletics at V.P.I.

As you have heard, I used to be connected with the University of Virginia, and I don't know whether on this particular occasion I am as well connected as I ought to be to talk to you.

In any event, I am glad to be here, and strangely enough, we dug up a clipping the other day from the **Herald Tribune** of June 28, 1932, just a little bit of which I would like to read to you:

"Radio broadcasts of football voted out by eastern colleges. The Eastern Intercollegiate Association, composed of 12 underwriters and 83 affiliates, comprising almost all the important colleges of the East, including five New York City institutions, voted unanimously yesterday to ban radio broadcasting of its football games this autumn."

I think we are much in the same position in television as we were in relation to radio at that time, and since I have spent almost all of my time concerning myself with tele-

vision, I would like to tell you a little something about the industry as it has grown up.

Television started on a commercial scale after the war, and only three years ago in November, 1946. It is true, as Mr. Jordan indicated, that we had some sets out before then, but we didn't have it on a really commercial basis until November, 1946, when the first sets on a commercial basis were made. In those three years, we have now in the public hands about $3\frac{1}{2}$ million television sets, and 100 television stations on the air. There never has been such a phenomenal growth in industry as television.

We now reach through television, as it is today, about $3\frac{1}{2}$ persons per television set which means that we reach, roughly, 11 to 12 million people per television broadcast. In five years we believe (we have projected our business on this basis) there will be 20 million television sets with the public. That means that we will reach, through television, approximately 75 million people. Television, therefore, is here with us. It is like the atomic bomb, it is here. How to handle it is another problem, but it is here.

In relation to the effect of television on intercollegiate sports, I have listened with admiration to the statistical work that Mr. Jordan has been doing. I do not propose to get into the statistical situation. As you know, as indicated last year, the attendance on football went up about 4 percent, intercollegiate, while the attendance in pro football, where they eliminated television broadcasting this year, decreased to about 9 per cent.

I was talking to General Kilpatrick the other day, who, as you know, runs Madison Square Garden. He told me that last year in connection with their hockey season — they televised and had a very poor team — attendance fell off. This year he has a much better team. He decided he would not televise it, and the attendance is off from last year. So as Mr. Jordan has indicated to you, I don't think any of us as of now know the real facts of the effect of television on attendance at intercollegiate sporting events, or any other sporting events, for that matter.

I would like to suggest, though, that until we get these statistics we don't blame everything in the world on television.

I picked up another clipping — which I thought you might be interested in, which came out in the newspaper the other day.

"False teeth sales held up well in January, but they fell off last month claims representative of one national distributor. People are spending all their money for television!"

Now, I want to get to the basic problem as I see it, and I want to point out to you what I consider a common problem

to both you and us in the broadcasting field. Television is not only an economic problem to you; it is an economic problem to us. I don't know whether you realize it or not, but the network televiser — as distinguished from radio broadcasting — does not know how to do it economically at all; there is not a broadcast or a televiser who is not losing a substantial sum this very minute in every network television broadcast that they are putting on the air, so we don't know how to handle it either.

We are charged under law with the responsibility of giving to the public and making available to the public the programs which it wants to hear and which it wants to see. I think that you are in the same situation as we in this regard, and I would like, if I may, with all humility, point this out to you. All of you represent great institutions, the bulwarks, I might say, of freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of expression in the country. The country counts on you for that. You are supported by state funds, by charitable contributions, some of you by contributions from churches. The public expects from you, leadership in this general and broad growth of our country, always in the maintenance of the liberty which we have.

Now, we are required by law to do that. I think you find people who represent institutions which by the very nature of your establishments have exactly the same objectives that we do. I think between us we both have an obligation to the public. You, through the media of the great sporting events which you put on in which go the entire nation, particularly the youth of the country and which have such a striking effect on the growth of our youth; we as public utilities required by law, and I hope required by the spirit that moves us as well. I think both of us have to join together in finding out how on an economical basis we and you, in giving to the public of what they are entitled to, will make available to them the programs on television that they are most vitally interested in — intercollegiate sports.

I can discuss with you a lot of things that have to do with the probability of increases in gate receipts, which is your problem, as I understand. I have, as Mr. Wilson indicated, been at one time or another in intercollegiate sports. As a matter of fact, I even got fired; I was a coach one time. So I am appreciative of the economic pressure on each of you in relation to your specific problems.

I have the same problem in my business, and all of us in the television business do, but I also want to charge you with this responsibility which we have assumed, that we have got to make available to the public the things that they want to see and the things they want to hear.

Peculiarly, the educational institutions and the broadcast-

ing companies, while we are a private enterprise, are charged with that responsibility, and I am authorized, on behalf of the broadcasters and televisers, the network televisers in this country, to offer to you every single bit of aid, including any financial assistance that you might want from us, in studying the problem and trying to arrive at a common understanding and a common objective and a common solution. In the long run we want to give to the public, as we always have, the things that they must have from both of us.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you, Mr. McConnell. Are there any questions that you might wish to direct to Mr. McConnell at this time?

Sir, we are very appreciative of your taking your time and your offer to assist us in this study.

We will continue with the reports. We will go now to the West Coast where they have a rapidly growing television area and have made a survey. I would like to call on Bill Hunter at this time for his report.

MR. BILL HUNTER: Tug says I have a report based on the survey, which is incorrect, although I think I can very briefly state the consensus of opinion on the part of us in the Pacific Coast Conference who have telecast our games.

I think we feel that the telecasting of football games has prompted a reduction in attendance. On the other hand, I would like to go on the record as far as I am concerned in stating that the surveys to date are not, in my opinion, conclusive. I believe that there are a lot of things that we yet have to learn in reference to television's effect on football games, and until such time as we have this conclusive information, I would like to go on record as favoring televising our athletic events at least for another season.

In 1947, we did not televise. In 1948, we televised and there were approximately 17,000 sets in the Los Angeles area. The comparative attendance at home games between '47 and '48 was just about the same, as far as University of Southern California was concerned. In 1949, we televised again, and there were about 250,000 sets. Now, the attendance compared with '48 and '49 was down. On the other hand, there are so many different people out of those that are watching television, or who have no television set and do not watch, that come to the football games through a period of one season. For the sake of argument, we would say at the University of Southern California there are, at the outside, 250,000 different people attending our home schedule. Then with what we have now, some 350,000 sets, there is potential of probably at least a million people looking at television. Out of that differential of 750,000 people, I believe that there will be a lot of interest created on the

part of television fans who will come to the games to see the color, to see the action.

Let us say that 200,000 out of the 750,000 looking at television have had an interest created for attending the game. If each one of those 200,000 would go to one game during the season, we will say, played by the University of Southern California and the University of California at Los Angeles, the attendance would be decidedly up.

I think, too, that much can be said about this innovation. When you first get a set, you want to see all that is going on, and then you become more selective, and finally if you aren't interested in athletics, you become interested, because you see it, and I think from there you go and attend these athletic events.

I don't know whether I have voiced the thinking of my contemporaries. I do say this again, that our attendance was down on the Coast, and I also want to go on record as desiring to continue with television until we have more information.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: We will now go to another section of the country.

I doubt if any area has studied television more astutely and carefully than the East. They have had several recent meetings. I think they have made several exhaustive surveys. I would like to call on Ralph Furey of Columbia University to give the E.C.A.C. report.

MR. RALPH FUREY: To review the background, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, primarily at the request and urging of the Eastern College Athletic Conference authorized a limited survey by Crosley during the 1948 football season. The fact that the National Collegiate Athletic Association found itself unable to complete this survey during the 1949 season was a bitter disappointment. However, the Eastern College Athletic Conference was not satisfied with an unfinished job, and so undertook a survey financed completely by our own member colleges.

A brief questionnaire was prepared and distributed by 38 members of our conference, all of whom compete in football and are affected, either directly or indirectly, by the televising of football games. Thirty thousand questionnaires were distributed at the end of this present season, and we have received 12,000 returns. The tabulation has not as yet been completed but a preliminary sampling of 2,300 returns indicates trends that are a matter of grave concern in regard to television's impact on intercollegiate sports in this area — and the effects noticed in this area must of necessity hold true in other sections of the country.

The survey showed that 16 plus per cent of those interviewed — and this was, remember, a special group of alumni closely tied to college football — thought that seeing a game over television was as good as actual attendance. More than that, another 13 plus per cent of these people whom we depend on most for loyal support may be lost to us through television. And, although we have no figures to base any claim on, it is a natural assumption that the percentage of loss will be even higher among that group which has no college affiliation.

Of even more interest is a breakdown on the basis of the size of the institutions involved. A study of the figures indicates that 27.1 per cent of alumni of the larger colleges believe that televiewing is as good as or better than actual attendance. Of the middle-sized colleges, 37.3 per cent believe the same thing. And of the smaller colleges, no less than 38.3 per cent believe that television is as good as or better than actual attendance. So it seems completely evident to us, on the basis of these facts, that the smaller institutions will be most affected by the televising of college football games.

While some of our larger institutions may think that television is a matter of no concern to them at this time, we believe that any great change in the present structure of intercollegiate athletics must eventually and of necessity affect all institutions — big and small.

We base our report on the following facts: (1) that we in the East have had the longest experience with the televising of football games; (2) that we have the largest television network in the country; (3) that our area is more heavily saturated with television sets than any area in the country — New York City alone has 1 million sets.

Therefore, our Committee presents the following report, voted unanimously at the annual meeting of the Eastern College Athletic Conference, to the National Collegiate Athletic Association:

The Television Committee of the Eastern College Athletic Conference has continued its study of all types of athletic telecasts and has come to the conclusion that television is a potential threat to the financial structure of intercollegiate athletics.

Since we represent that geographical area of the United States which has had the widest television experience, we feel qualified to state that a large majority of the Eastern College Athletic Conference membership has been and will continue to be seriously affected by this new medium. While a minority of member institutions may not be immediately

affected, your Committee is primarily concerned with the future welfare of the majority of members of the Conference rather than with the present position of a favored few.

We recognize that independent action by regional groups such as the Eastern College Athletic Conference can serve no useful purpose. Therefore, we recommend that the Eastern College Athletic Conference authorize the Television Committee to present our position, based on long experience and comprehensive studies, to the National Collegiate Athletic Association, and urge that organization to take prompt and definite action on this important matter.

The action that we urge is to wit:

We recommend the immediate appointment of an active and representative television committee of the National Collegiate Athletic Association with instructions that that committee make a thorough investigation of all material now available and report to the Executive Committee of the National Collegiate Athletic Association at the regular June meeting. Furthermore, if the study of the television committee indicates that action of any type should be necessary, that steps be instituted to provide for amendments to the Constitution of the National Collegiate Athletic Association in order that television be properly controlled.

Pending any possible action at the 1951 convention, we urge that the National Collegiate Athletic Association recommend to its members that no television commitments be made beyond the 1950-51 college year.

Gentlemen, I think that our conference would agree completely, and our Television Committee would agree completely with the statements made by the two representatives of the industry who have spoken so far, Mr. Jordan and Mr. McConnell, that at this time nobody has any final answers. We are the first ones to admit that, but we do say that this is a tremendous problem, that we are dealing with a new medium; it is here, it is on us, and it is important enough so we had better find out what the answer is, then let the chips fall where they may.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you, Ralph. We are indebted to the E.C.A.C. for this fine survey which they made at their own expense.

What is your pleasure as to the recommendation that has been made? Do you wish that this be presented at our business meeting Saturday for action, or should the recommendation come from the group here today?

MR. FUREY: Do you want to hear from any other areas?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Yes, possibly we had better complete the area reports.

I would like to call on Tom Hamilton, of the University of

Pittsburgh, who was one of our committee, and who, I think, has something to say about the ideas in that area.

MR. TOM HAMILTON: I have no prepared talk. I think I will just give you an opinion, which is entirely personal, and probably not based on extensive facts, which the other gentlemen who have spoken before me had.

I have watched with interest the development of television, and certainly feel that in the field of sport, it will have a great effect. I believe it is true that the eastern experience has been far greater than in any other part of the country, so I am in entire accord with the suggestion of Ralph Furey and his committee that a very close study be inaugurated prior to next year in order that the collegiate group may properly deal with this new medium.

My experience has been with Navy, and now at Pittsburgh. At Navy we operated for a few years in hopes of helping television get started. It was done on a gratis basis to give them the opportunity of televising our games, and we felt that we might obtain some good will in the area, and also prepare for any future activity in the industry. Frankly, our experience was rather disappointing. As television sets grew in numbers in the area, our attendance figures went down, and from a monetary standpoint, which is probably a poor way of looking at it, the remuneration that came in from television only amounted to about 300 seats at the stadium, and we felt that probably thousands stayed away. Possibly we are in an area there where this was a new setup as far as television goes. Perhaps Howard Cole can tell you it was better this year. However, at Pittsburgh I can state that I wrote to Father Murphy of Notre Dame after the announcement that Notre Dame was to telecast their games in Pittsburgh on four of the Saturdays when we had home games scheduled at Pittsburgh. I told him of our concern over this.

We are friendly competitors. Certainly our two universities are most friendly, and hope to maintain those relationships. However, we felt that in speaking in a friendly fashion and anticipating some trouble in that field, we wondered whether they had considered our problem and whether other people, who would not be as frank, would build up ill will toward them for invading their territories.

While I have no accurate figures to indicate the loss of attendance at Pittsburgh through the televising of these games, I know that it was appreciable from my own questioning of television owners and we got all the information we could send on in connection with the E.C.A.C. survey. Certainly we feel that we will not be affected as greatly there as the smaller colleges, and I believe that a further

survey from the small colleges would be very advisable in this connection.

I am afraid that isn't very comprehensive, but it is as far as I can go at the present time.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: In the Middle West, in Chicago, we have probably the second or third great television area, and Ted Payseur, Director of Athletics of the Northwestern University, was asked to give a report on his findings.

MR. TED PAYSEUR: I agree with the other speakers. I do not think any survey is conclusive proof. I was asked by the N.C.A.A. to send out a questionnaire to some of the western universities and in our Western Conference, and I think there are representatives here from the West who may want to defend a few statements that I think are advisable to make at this time.

I feel in the Middle West we are somewhat in our infancy in television. Some of our midwestern schools televised for the first year last fall, some for two, some for three and some for four. I would like to give an expression from the questionnaire reports that came in.

First, I would like to present a few facts in regard to the Chicago area to show you the increase in the television sets in that particular area. In September of this year, 1949, there were 223,000 sets. November of this year, there were 309,000 sets, and the latest report around Christmas time, manufacturers said they couldn't fill all the orders. They are close to half a million sets in the Chicago area.

Also, last fall there were three channels running from east to west, and only one channel running from west to east. One fact that I found out, before coming, that might be disturbing to us in the Middle West is the fact that some 18 or 20 cities, Minneapolis, Des Moines, Louisville, Rock Island, will be in a position next year to tune in on any network of television. In our own conference, Indiana, Purdue and Iowa were not televised. In the second group, we have schools that have televised for one year, namely, Wisconsin and Ohio State. Minnesota for two years, and in the third group, Illinois, Michigan, Notre Dame and Northwestern have televised three and four years.

Considering this first group, I would like to give the expression of these schools. Wisconsin figures it did not affect their season ticket sales. One or two games, it did affect the single-game ticket sales. They don't think it has affected the large universities as much as it has the small universities, and they are somewhat against the network of television.

Ohio State, for instance, has only one year of television. It has not affected them whatsoever in attendance. They

don't wish to recommend any legislation whatsoever at this stage.

Minnesota, which has televised two years, has the same opinion, that it does not affect them. They do not credit any decrease or increase to television. They do not care for any legislation at this time, but they believe in further study.

In the third group that have televised three to four years, Illinois was televised for three years and they do not credit television for an increase or decrease. They feel that the rate they receive for television does not compensate for the loss of any ticket orders. They strongly believe it is imperative that somebody like the N.C.A.A. step into the television picture to insure that methods of handling television and rates, etc., be uniform and supervised.

The University of Michigan has televised for three years. I think they had one of the largest attendance records in the country, and they feel very strongly that the member institutions should adopt some legislation prohibiting television of all collegiate football games played by a number of institutions. The representatives of the schools are here and can speak to that.

The University of Notre Dame has not been affected either way on television. They do feel that there has been a decided interest in television, and their season ticket sales have increased. They believe it unwise at this time to move too fast or too quickly against television before a more adequate study has been made.

At Northwestern, where we have televised for four years, I would say definitely it does not have an effect upon our season ticket sales. I do feel that it affects some of our individual games. A very personal example that bothers me came up in my own household. I have a daughter who is a senior in school. All the dormitories and sorority and fraternity houses have put in television sets, and students are losing interest in going out to contests with television facilities. We are losing control of students. When they have free tickets to go to a game, they prefer to stay home, and that is a serious problem to me. That is a personal observation, but I think it is worth putting in here.

We personally feel that the rates we get from television at the present time certainly do not compensate for any loss you may have in ticket sales, and we agree somewhat with the Illinois opinion, that some group under the N.C.A.A. should have the controlling power in regard to uniformity of rates and handling of television, etc.

I would just like to leave a few observations which I have made each year in regard to professional promotion in the Middle West for what it is worth. My basis for the statements come from Mr. Gallagher of the Cubs, Mr. Wirtz, con-

nected with the Chicago Stadium, the manager of the White Sox, Mr. Ward of the Tribune. The Cubs in baseball say it hasn't hurt their attendance and they are going to continue. In Los Angeles, the Cubs had a poor farm team. Attendance fell off, but they don't blame television. The Hollywood team attendance fell off, and they feel television did hurt the Hollywood team.

Here is an observation that may be worthwhile considering professional football. The Bear-Cardinal game in 1948, which was sold out, was not televised. They had something like 4000 grandstand standing-room seats — they call them seats — and 900 bleacher standing room. These were all sold out in '48. In 1949, for the Bears and Cardinals game; they didn't announce they were going to televise until about three days before the game, and of these 4000 grandstand seats, they only sold one-fourth of the standing room; of the 900 bleacher seats, they only sold about one-fourth.

Other promotions through the Middle West, the Golden Gloves and All-Star football game feel they were hurt by television. The All-Star football game will not be televised this year. Professional hockey has not been televised, nor professional basketball.

The professional promoters throughout the Middle West feel that television works two ways. It helps boxing, but it has adverse effects on established sports like college and professional football. There will always be an exception to the general rule. In a long season, there is a chance to make converts in the early part who may attend games in the latter part. Baseball games are not played in bad weather, so it is not affected by television in bad weather.

That is an expression from the different schools that have televised over a period of three or four years, and as I say, representatives of these schools are here.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Horace Renegar, from Tulane, was asked to study this. I don't know whether you have made a survey, but we would like to have your observations.

MR. HORACE RENEGAR: We have avoided televising in New Orleans. We had the good fortune to be late in getting television in the South. Since we were late getting it (it came to us about a year ago), we thought we would stand by and benefit by your experiences, and delay getting into television as long as possible. We have succeeded in staying out of it for a year, and we are hopeful that we can stay out again next year.

Georgia Tech, however, did televise last year. Charlie Griffin, the business manager of Tech, is here. I believe he said the two stations in Atlanta are owned by newspapers there, and he said they just put it up to the newspapers to sell them out. They said on all sell-outs they may televise.

In our station we don't have that good fortune. It is owned by a member of the board of Tulane, so you can see that there will be pressure, but I don't think we can tell them to sell out the stadium, more particularly 2000 seats.

I am sorry I can't give you the benefit of some experience in the South, but we have had so little experience in television I will have to ask to be excused.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Is Father Hesburgh of Notre Dame in the audience? Father, do you have a few observations you might give us at this time?

FATHER HESBURGH: I came into this meeting feeling very ignorant and, at least I think, like most of you, I am leaving with a feeling I am not quite as ignorant as when I came in. I have never come across anything so complicated and with so many interrelationships as this television picture. Whenever I think about it and what should be done about it, I am reminded of a story which is more in my line, because my specialty, as you can notice from the backward collar, is theology. As you know, in the early days of Christianity they had a hard time getting started. One day they beat up St. Peter and one of his companions. So they called them up before the council and said, "This has got to stop; either you stop talking or we are going to beat up on you again." They kept on talking and they beat them again. That is not good English, but I know you get the point. The third time they were called up before the council, there was a wise old man named Gamaliel (you can read this in the Book if you want to). He stood up before the whole crowd and said, "The way I look at these fellows, they are going around propagandizing and trying to sell something. It boils down to this: If this thing is from God, there is not much we can do about it, it is going to go; if it is not from God, it won't go." He said, "If it is from God, we can't stop it; if it is not, it will die of its own accord."

That is not entirely analogous, because I don't think television is exactly of God, but I think it is here. As one of the gentlemen said, like the atomic bomb, we don't know where it is going. Maybe it is to the best interest of all schools and the whole organization not to have it go the way it is going now. I think all of us feel the same; if that is true, we don't want to see it the way it is going now. We want to benefit the whole of sports as much as we can, because what is good for sports is good for the country at large.

If we can show by honest and sincere studies that such-and-such should be done, I think we, as well as everybody else, ought to do such-and-such, but we all want to be from Missouri and be shown what the situation is before we act.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Is Howard W. Tomilson here,

from Wayne University? Is Willis J. Stetson of Swarthmore College here?

Gentlemen, that completes the list that we had. We attempted to get large universities and small. I will now open the meeting for general discussion and for any ideas that you may have.

DEAN CARR (University of Kansas): I would like for you to ask the gentleman from Tulane, since there has been no televising, how about his attendance through the last year or two?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Horace, did you hear the question?

MR. RENEGAR: I know our attendance figures were up about a total of 20,000 over the past year. We haven't televised at any time, but our attendance was about 20,000 over 1948.

DEAN CARR: How about 1948 over 1947?

MR. RENEGAR: 1948 was lower than 1947. 1949 was above 1948. However, we did permit a movie of each of our home games to be shown on Tuesday evenings after the game, but that didn't seem to affect us any. If anything, I believe that helped.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Are there other questions or comments? I think there is no use dodging the fact that we are putting a tremendous show on for a lot of people. I witnessed a network show of one of the name bands, and heard with astonishment what the estimated figure of the cost was. If the television outfit had to put on one of our great football games, they couldn't afford it.

As some of the speakers have said, there is no way of estimating the damage that is being done, but certainly we must keep a very close watch. I think the N.C.A.A. has to continue their investigation.

MR. BUSHNELL: I feel very strongly that the figure that Ralph Furey gave you, that 30 per cent figure, deserves heavy emphasis. I believe if any of you were in the manufacturing business and suddenly found out that among your good customers there were 30 per cent who preferred somebody else's product, you would be quite worried about it and would want to do something about it.

I think in this situation things are likely to get worse before they get better. Television is improving all the time and I don't know that any of our stadium seats are getting any better, particularly those in the end zone.

I think, too, another point that has been brought into discussion too frequently is the radio parallel, which I don't think applies. I don't know of anyone that would rather listen to a radio broadcast, even with Red Barber doing the broadcasting, than see the game itself. On the other hand,

here we have 30 per cent of an interested group of people who have stated that they feel they are just as well off, or better off getting a television view of the game as being present at the game.

The atomic bomb has been mentioned several times this afternoon. I would like to suggest that we wait for the atomic bomb to destroy our stadiums instead of doing it with television.

FATHER JOHN MURPHY (Notre Dame): I wonder if the Eastern Collegiate group has any way of knowing how many of the 30 per cent said they would prefer television. Did all those people completely stay away from their games this year?

MR. FUREY: Completely, although as I said, the tabulation will not be completed for some time. It will be made available to the N.C.A.A. when it is completed.

FATHER MURPHY: Is that one of the questions on your questionnaire, as to whether they had attended any games this year?

MR. FUREY: Yes, but the information is not available as of today.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: One reaction that your Secretary has received in correspondence is the impact on high school attendance where a number of high schools in different areas felt they were getting very badly hurt. It is unfortunate we don't have the benefit of those surveys. They are the source of our college material. They need their finances for their athletic program. That is one thing I hope in any future surveys we can get some accurate data on.

Fritz Crisler, have you any observations you would like to make?

MR. CRISLER: I don't believe so. Mr. Chairman, other than what would contribute further to confusion. I came into this meeting completely ignorant. Unlike my colleague of Notre Dame, I go out even more ignorant, I believe, as a result of the conflicting reports. My thinking, which, of course, is influenced by our particular situation, would conform more closely to the report that Ralph gave than the one that Mr. Jordan gave. I should hasten to say I don't believe we have been affected by television in so far as attendance is concerned. We have been televising the complete season for three years. Three years ago our average attendance was 71,000-odd. In 1948, it was 81,000-odd, and strangely enough, in 1949, last year, it was 91,000-odd. So I don't know whether television should be credited with that increase or not. I am inclined to arrive at the point, however, that I don't think television can help us much more in that area, and I think probably the only thing it would do would be to damage us. I recognize the force of Mr. McCon-

nell's argument concerning the public service that we owe as educational institutions, and I realize full well that they are obligated by legislation to give the public what they want. I think we as colleges and universities have not yet arrived at that obligation. It may not be far distant when we will, because those of us who are state institutions. I believe, in some of our states already we have legislation not only suggesting that we must play some other opponent, but we must televise, and so maybe we will get state legislation in our various states to force us into television.

I appreciate the public service aspect. However, I don't believe our stadium full of good will and public service on five or six afternoons in the fall will help us a bit on our budget. We have a substantial budget to meet, as I believe everybody else has, and I don't think we can look to subsidies from Washington yet, the same as the peanut growers, dairymen and potato growers, in meeting that budget, and so I am very much concerned.

I am concerned particularly about the attendance, because we have a weather condition when we get back into November that can affect us a great deal. Television can give you a seat on the 50-yard line, and if we had all of our 97,000 seats on the 50-yard line, I wouldn't be much concerned. The thing I am concerned about is not filling up the 50-yard line, but the fellow who sits in the end zone is the one I am a little worried about. I don't think he will be there if he can get a 50-yard-line seat on television.

I agree with Asa; I think the equities are entirely different in television than they are in radio. I don't think they can be comparable at all. My thinking has led me to the point, despite the fact that I don't think we have been hurt, that we ought to do something as a convention, as a N.C.A.A. organization, on this matter of television because of the equities in it. I think if we go much further we are going to be so deep in public service and public opinion that we couldn't get out if we wanted to.

I should be entirely willing to support, if it met with any popular frame of mind at all, a provision whereby none of us in the N.C.A.A. and colleges and universities would go on live television, next year or the year after, and then for us all to push the postgame movie rights for promotion and interest, as a part of public service.

I regret to say that I am very much confused and can't add very much to the discussion. I got out of football coaching because I was confused, and now that I am in this, I think I will go back to coaching.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: We haven't heard any comment from the Missouri Valley area. Reaves Peters, the Commis-

sioner of the Big Seven, is here. Reaves, have you any observations you might want to make?

MR. PETERS: I don't believe so, Tug. We haven't been bothered with it in our area up to the present time. We have only one station in the Middle West, and they have only a few sets, and I think they televised a few games on an experimental basis last year. Up until now we haven't felt any results from it. But I think we would like to go along just as carefully as the rest of you. We have decided not to make any long-term commitments, not over one year at the outside, but as yet it is not a particular problem. However, I did go into this somewhat with coliseums for winter programs about two months ago, and I received reports from most of the coliseums in the nation on their basketball setup. Most of them are very pessimistic about the results. One large garden in the East — not in New York — lost a lot of money last year in their televising of hockey. They have determined not to televise anything in that garden from now on, and those were just about the results that we got from all of the queries we made along that line. We are just going along slowly and rather waiting to see what develops here.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Any other comments from the floor? I think the only way we can benefit from this meeting is if everybody who has anything to say, please feel free to get up and talk.

MEMBER: From your introduction of Mr. Jordan, I gathered he was making a graduate study. He was later referred to as a representative of the radio industry. I would like to know just where he stands.

DR. E. LEROY MERCER (University of Pennsylvania): As far as our experiences are concerned, he is representing the University of Pennsylvania.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: He is representing the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Furey, do you wish action on your recommendation?

MR. FUREY: I would like to move that this group recommend to the business meeting of the National Collegiate Athletic Association tomorrow the recommendation presented by me in the E.C.A.C. report, and when I make that motion, let me point out that that is not a television ban. All we are doing is saying in that report that this is an important thing; let's find out about it. The way to find out is to make a thorough investigation. That is all we said in that report, and I so move.

DEAN CARR: Would you read the recommendation?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Would you care to come and read it, Ralph?

(Mr. Furey re-read the recommendation.)

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Is there a second to this motion?

MR. CRISLER: I support it.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: You have heard the motion; it has been seconded. Any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying "aye"; contrary-minded the same. It is carried.

Unless there is further desire to continue the discussion, we will stand adjourned.

B. SMALL COLLEGE GROUP

Chairman: DR. J. H. NICHOLS, Oberlin College

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I might say that this is the Small College Group of the N.C.A.A. For those who possibly do not know what a small college is, we have usually made the distinction that it is any college with 2000 students or under. But everyone is welcome here, whether he represents a small college or not, if he is interested in the discussion that is on the program.

We are going to conduct the program with, first, the speaker of the day, followed by a discussion of the N.C.A.A. Sanity Code, and I don't know of any two men who are better able to discuss it than the men we have here today.

Before introducing the first speaker, I, personally, would like to pay a tribute to the speaker of the morning, Karl Leib, the President of the N.C.A.A., and to the work that he has done in the N.C.A.A.

This morning, with about twenty minutes' notice, he delivered the main speech, and I think that all of you who heard him were challenged by what he said. I think we all realize that, from the standpoint of the N.C.A.A., we perhaps have reached a crossroads. We can go one way or the other. Perhaps there is no middle of the road, but there always are compromises.

Certainly, it was true what he said this morning. He remarked that in the judgment of many people if the Sanity Code cannot succeed as an instrument on which college administrations can rely in an attempt to direct and control athletics along educational lines, to many of us it would seem that the other direction lies in the direction of chaos.

We are all going to have the opportunity to stand up and be counted as to which direction we prefer. There are many arguments, and I think most of those things will be presented here today. You can bring up any questions you have that relate to the question of the day.

Certainly, there is tremendous interest in this Code, and certainly, it has focused the attention of college presidents and administrators and those in control of athletics on what are some of the critical problems we face.

The first speaker today is a graduate of Princeton; but, as I told Bill, we won't hold that against him. He is a man who has had considerable interest and considerable experience in the field of athletics.

After graduating from Princeton, he was a Rhodes scholar. In 1922, he was captain of the Princeton track team and the A.A.U. 440 champion that year. He was the British champion in 1923, when he was a Rhodes scholar.

In 1924, he was a member of the Olympic team, and a member of the championship 1600-meter relay which established, at that time, a world's record for that event.

Incidentally, before he became a Rhodes scholar, he competed against Oxford and Cambridge in the Princeton and Cornell meet and won the 440 for Princeton and Cornell. And then in 1925, as a Rhodes scholar, he won the same event for Oxford and Cambridge. So he was playing, as Ernie Pyle said, both sides of the ocean.

In World War I he was in the Marine Corps, and in World War II he gained international fame for his work as Director of the American Red Cross in charge of all activities in Great Britain, Africa and Italy.

After his return from the war, he gave up a well-established practice here in the legal profession to become President of Oberlin College in 1946.

So I think Bill Stevenson, as a man who is a participant, a friend, a college administrator and a college president is well qualified to speak to us, and we are happy to have him here today. Mr. William E. Stevenson, President of Oberlin College.

MR. STEVENSON: As I was brushing out the cuffs of my nylon shirt this morning on the train, I couldn't help thinking of some of the names I have known in the N.C.A.A. through the years. I hark back to such people as Terry McGovern, Malcolm Farmer, Bill Bingham, the Princetonians, Joe Ray Croft, "Lefty" Davies, and that youngster who has proved so precocious, Asa Bushnell.

It is a real pleasure to be here. I followed the proceedings of the N.C.A.A. for a great many years, but this happens to be the first meeting I have had the pleasure of attending.

The other day I was being introduced to an alumni group in Cincinnati, and the chairman said that I was on the 1600-millimeter relay team. I began to think that one over, and I am not sure that isn't a pretty good distance at this stage of the game.

I assume that basically there isn't a great deal of controversy about some of the things that I am going to touch upon. We have common problems, and it is particularly interesting to feel that this division of the N.C.A.A. — the so-called small colleges — is working so steadfastly in a direction which we at Oberlin, at least, approve of very much.

From reading reports of prior proceedings I would assume that there is substantial correctness in three main propositions.

First, all of us today are identified with institutions which are seriously dedicated to education and wholeheartedly working in the cause of education. Education is our purpose, certainly, and our reason for existence, and we should be

impatient with anything that interferes with it and be unhappy if we are not doing a good educational job.

I recognize, of course, that the word "education" is subject to ambiguity, and although it is on our tongues quite frequently we might differ about its exact meaning. In looking it up in Webster's the other day, I noticed one definition that "education is the training of animals." I assume that all of us can think of at least one incident when that might be an appropriate division of the definition, but for purposes here today let's pass that one.

H. A. L. Fisher, who was at one time head of one of the Oxford colleges, once defined education as all that remains after you have forgotten everything that you learned in school or college, and I think that there is a good deal of profoundness in that definition and a good deal of food for thought; but once again I don't think that particular definition is going to help us with the immediate problems before us here today.

Herbert Spencer stated it quite simply when he said that education was to prepare us for complete living. I suggest that we accept that definition and agree that complete living means living intelligently, fruitfully, happily and usefully.

Education's objective is to produce mature, well-adjusted and, of course, healthy human beings. In an ideal state an educated person should feel that everything within him is being used not only to his own advantage but to the advantage of everyone.

It is my second assumption that all of us here firmly believe that athletics are a means and not an end in themselves. If athletics do not make a sensible and sound contribution to education as we understand it, then athletics have no justification in our college program.

By the same token, I shall assume it to be our belief that a sound mind and a sound body are inseparable and that athletics can and should make a body more sound and even help to develop a sounder mind.

General George Wingate once well summarized the value of athletics when he said that "athletics teaches better than anything else promptness, quickness in emergencies, self-reliance, control of temper, square dealing and determination — all those qualities which will best enable you to bear yourself manfully in the great battle of life."

Cecil Rhodes appreciated the contribution of athletics toward the well-rounded man when he prescribed that no student should be elected a Rhodes scholar at Oxford unless he should be moderately fond of outdoor sports. Perhaps we Americans should take particular note of that word "moderately."

As our third proposition, I shall assume frank recognition of the fact that some athletic programs are detrimental to the cause of education and that they are incompatible with the objects to which most of our colleges, especially those here today, are dedicated. I refer, of course, to the deplorable present-day overemphasis on big-time athletics, particularly in football.

It seems to me that we are certainly losing sight of our educational objectives when we permit school and college athletic contests to degenerate into Roman holidays. As we well know, such hippodroming has taken the game away from the boys and has resulted in big-time show business.

Many of our young people are no longer amateur athletes in the true sense of that term but are really gladiators or mercenaries in the center of the arena entertaining the howling mob.

I can't resist interrupting my prepared text to recall the three years I spent at Oxford. Some of you are familiar with the English system of sports, but no one who has ever lived under it for any period of time and actually engaged in sports overseas (the way I had the privilege of doing) can ever forget the real amateur approach to sports in English universities.

Perhaps there isn't as much opportunity there as there might be for boys of limited means and, frankly, it takes a good deal of wherewithal or scraping of the bottom of the barrel to go through a season over there without one single penny for equipment, for rubbers, for transportation or in any way, but I did it for three years in track. I happened to be on their team a couple of years, and every single one of those events was conducted entirely by boys. We had no coaches of any kind, and yet we had a lot of fun. And, as you know, those teams do come over here and make a fairly good showing.

I grant you that is an unusual situation but, as I suggested, it did make an indelible impression, I think, on all Americans who have had that privilege, and I can't help thinking in my mind that that is a sort of ideal. I will frankly admit now to you that it tempers to a considerable extent my own personal point of view and is reflected, no doubt, in some of the things I am saying here today.

I'd like to ask if anyone can seriously and conscientiously argue that it helps a boy in the long run to ballyhoo him up to national stardom. Can many youngsters survive such a handicap and still reach their full potentialities as useful citizens? Is there anything more tragic than some of our athletic heroes of yesteryear, too many of whom are still perennial sophomores? We all have seen them snatched away from their natural environment and thrust into posi-

tions that were artificial and for which few of them were adapted or suited.

In effect, they had been given a life sentence in an unreal and too often unappreciative world merely because they were born with shifty hips or brawny biceps or exceptional muscular coordination or control.

In this day and age, it seems to me we cannot afford to permit our good young men to be demoralized by such a system. We cannot spare them. School and college athletics can only be justified as education through sport and fun, not as an incidental part of public entertainment. There may be no business like show business, but surely show business is no business of a sensible college athletic program.

If I am right that there is agreement in this group at least on these three propositions, what choices have we so far as intercollegiate athletics are concerned?

First, I suppose we can give in to the pressures for the big-time showmanship, winning teams and cash-producing results and go all out in every conceivable way and method in that particular direction. I am sure most of us would doubt that such a program could be successful year in and year out and still conform to the provisions of the Sanity Code.

While as the head of a liberal arts college that claims to maintain high educational standards I happen to deplore college football or any other hippodrome sport on a big-time, neoprofessional basis, I must concede that even though I do not share their viewpoint those who openly admit that their programs violate the Code at least deserve the credit for being honest about it.

A second choice is to try compliance with the Code despite temptations or ambitions for championship teams and the need for gate receipts. We all know the dynamite in that situation. If a college chews up and swallows the cake of big headlines, glamorized players and financial success, almost certainly it cannot have at the same time its cake of Code compliance. So long as gate receipts are in the forefront of our thinking — and of course we all need money — is there any doubt that recruitment, subsidizing and other abuses are almost inevitable?

The third choice has a great appeal to me, and, I know, to many of you here today; it is to keep athletics in a proper place in the educational program, preferably away from big-time operations, and to try to give the game, as far as possible, back to the boys. As I see it, only by so doing can we live up to our obligation, as educational institutions, to give our students a sound education along the lines of our previous definition.

I don't know whether many of you happened to read the

little pamphlet recently distributed in which the late President Guerry of Sewanee made what I feel is a very able speech, but I think he put his finger on what I am talking about at the moment in a paragraph or two.

I'd like to quote very briefly. He said, "To give its students a sense of values is one of the main and one of the essential objectives in an educational institution. When, however, a college or university places such undue emphasis upon the importance of a winning, subsidized team as compared with its apparent emphasis upon the real qualities of an educational institution, and when a college or university pays its top teachers and scholars, the men upon whom the college or university rests, far less than its football coach, the result is a distortion of values. The actual result is that colleges and universities are destroying a sense of values for the students and the public."

Still quoting him for one more sentence: "These institutions undermine the very objectives they are created to achieve. They fail in the things they were established to fulfill. While our country and its people need so desperately to have a sense of values and a real perspective, the colleges and universities are unable, because they have rendered themselves unable, to give their students and our people these great and necessary attributes."

There may be some people among the smaller colleges who feel that for practical reasons a strictly amateur and honestly sane athletic program with its inherent deemphasis on the commercial or professional approach may be difficult, if not impossible, to carry out. I am very sympathetic, as we all are, to that point of view.

The difficulties in the placing of athletics on an equal and happy partnership between clean-cut sport and education is very well known to every one of us. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the choice is a very clear one, at least for the smaller colleges.

How can a healthy athletic program be half means toward a financial objective, toward public entertainment, and half designed to educate the whole man and produce mature individuals who will take responsibility and provide leadership for their own generation?

Personally, I believe many of us in the smaller colleges must make a definite decision in this matter. I do not see how the two diametrically opposed courses of action which I have stressed can be reconciled.

I am glad that there are many smaller colleges which have seen the handwriting on the wall, and that they are headed strongly in the direction of including intercollegiate sports in a unified athletic program all financed by college funds. I take it that such colleges have recognized the fact, and ac-

cepted the fact, that the more highly commercialized and the finer show football becomes in the large centers, the less emphasis small college football will receive from the public and press, and therefore, the less financial return football will bring in to the smaller institutions.

Before concluding my remarks, may I make three observations:

First, apart from the logic of the situation — that is, the ideals and aims of true education are incompatible with what is going on in the present world of intercollegiate sport — I think that colleges which cannot finance big-time athletics out of gate receipts have a moral responsibility to give up the big time and reemphasize a strong intramural program and a reasonably geared intercollegiate one.

A few years ago, Dr. Ernest Wilkins, my predecessor, made a study of football costs in twenty-two typical independent liberal arts colleges. Included in that group were these: Alleghany, Bates, Beloit, Bowdoin, Carlton, Colby, Denison, Hamilton, Hampden-Sydney, Haverford, Hobart, Knox, Lawrence, Oberlin, Pomona, St. John's, Susquehanna, Swarthmore, Trinity, Washington and Jefferson, Ohio Wesleyan and Wooster.

The expenses listed were the proportion of the coach's salary based on time that should be charged to football, official supplies and equipment, care of grounds, travel, payments to visiting teams and all other expenses such as medical, maintenance of equipment, movies, postage, advertising, telephone, telegraph, payments to trainers, etc. In other words, it was a fairly inclusive questionnaire.

That survey revealed that even football is a direct expense to the college and that in order to be maintained it must be financed as an integral part of the physical education department budget.

At the time of the survey (which is now ten years ago) only two of the twenty-two colleges showed a surplus of income over expense. It was \$1402 in one case, and \$79 in the other. Taking all twenty-two colleges, the average expense for the conduct of football was \$8380, and the average loss was \$1743.

It seems safe to say that those figures would be at least double today. Those figures answer the myth that, so far as small colleges are concerned, football is always a great money-maker and is the financial angel that carries the rest of the program. On the contrary, the football program in most of the small colleges not only was not a source of support for the other athletic programs, but it was itself a direct expense to the college along with the other athletic activities.

And let's not forget that the average of \$1743 (which I

am sure should be doubled today) of college funds required to maintain the program was the equivalent of income at four per cent on \$43,000 worth of endowment. If that latter figure were brought up to date, it would probably be near \$100,000 today.

These enlightening facts should cause us to ask ourselves quite frankly whether an elaborate intercollegiate football program is justified for the smaller colleges if a substantial endowment income subsidy is required to sustain it. Or, to put it another way, if those of us in the smaller colleges are using income from endowment funds to assist our athletic activity, is it not our solemn obligation to see that such moneys are conscientiously spent on features that have the best educational value?

As a second final observation, I would remind you that it is possible to maintain a healthy and successful sports program without recruitment, subsidization, large gate receipts, high coaches' salaries or other excesses.

If I may be permitted to take my own college for a moment purely as an example, I think we are doing just that right now at Oberlin. Last year, while we only had a fair degree of success in football and baseball, we did win four out of five Ohio Conference championships; that is, in cross-country, swimming, tennis and track. We also have an undefeated team in soccer, so that is really five teams that were successful.

I think I can conscientiously say that there wasn't a boy on those teams who didn't come from normal material found among our regular students and without any prerequisites or privileges for the athletes concerned. They were not released from laboratories early, they had no special training tables, and in every case they had to meet the high scholarship standards of all students and in a great many cases they had to earn their own way in addition.

We feel that we did not let those boys down. We gave them the educational experience which they had a right to receive from us and, at the same time, I think we had a lot of fun in those sports.

I know that most of the colleges represented here today are conducting their programs on the same sort of basis, and I think it is time we got more publicity among our friends in the press about the fact that at least the small colleges are able to give this a sensible and sound approach. Too many of us, I think, are put in the same category as the big institutions, and so I rather think the public is generally misinformed about what many of us are able to do.

As a final observation, I would like to say quite frankly that I believe (at least in the smaller colleges) most of the responsibility for the kind of athletic program being con-

ducted rests squarely on the shoulders of the president. Don't get me wrong. Far be it from me to suggest that a mere college president has such omnipotence or can run things to suit himself. I am well aware that is a myth; that would be too far from the truth. But I do say that while the situation may be too complex in the big institutions and the strait jacket may be too tight, in most colleges with which I am familiar it would be most difficult, I think, to maintain an unhealthy overemphasis even in one sport in the face of the positive disapproval of the president and his forthright insistence on true educational values.

In other words, I don't feel that we college presidents have a right to duck this question and leave it to you gentlemen, directors of athletics and coaches, to face this entirely on the firing line alone.

Personally, I think that most of us in the smaller colleges away from the pressures of metropolitan centers (and I say this without any feeling that it is sour grapes) can thank our lucky stars the high-pressure sports tend to pass us by and leave us more and more alone. By sheer force of circumstance we are being placed in the position to take constructive leadership in maintaining old programs and experimenting with and developing new ones that are educationally sound and in the best interest of each student entrusted to our care.

We can put our time, effort, imagination and financial resources into the philosophy of athletics as a sport and not a business. We can indelibly impress upon each of our students before they leave us that athletics should be participated in for the love of the game, that one does one's best to win, but takes one's loss, if there is one, like a gentleman.

We in the smaller colleges can set an example right now that most institutions in the country will envy and may some day wish to emulate. It is a most hopeful sign that this particular group has been thinking about some of these things, and is earnestly trying to adhere to the finest traditions of the amateur code even in the face of many pressures in a contrary direction.

I can assure you that at Oberlin we are most anxious to cooperate with those of you who share our views that the time is right to pull in our belts and show bravely leadership, if necessary, in steering away from anything that smacks of showmanship and big business and in carrying out a program under which each boy plays to win but not in a situation in which educational integrity is sacrificed.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Thank you very much, Bill. You have laid the foundation for what I believe ought to be a very interesting symposium and a very interesting panel.

When Bill says that he realizes a college president in a

school like Oberlin doesn't have absolute control, he is referring to our very democratic faculty system which sometimes makes him find it difficult to even accomplish the things he'd like to accomplish in an educational way. I suppose that is true in many of the small college institutions.

We are going to move right along to the panel discussion on the Sanity Code, and the first speaker is someone whom you all know, a long, long-time friend of the small colleges, a man who has contributed enormously to the Small College Group and its programs as chairman, and also a man who has made tremendous contributions to the N.C.A.A., especially of late as chairman of the Compliance Committee. I don't know of anyone who has been in a tougher spot than "Pop" Houston, and I don't know anyone better qualified to speak on the Sanity Code and some of the problems that it presents to the small college than Clarence P. Houston of Tufts, affectionately known to all of us as "Pop."

MR. HOUSTON: Thank you, Nick, for those kind words. I shall treasure them.

While I was listening to the excellent address of Bill Stevenson, running through my mind was how a veteran of the first world war in the Marine Corps and a college president could retain such a youthful appearance. I am going to ask him at the close of the session just what he uses for hair dye.

Gentlemen, this program which the N.C.A.A. embarked upon two years ago is an interesting and a courageous one. I am glad to have had a modest part in it. It is a little difficult for me, because I notice that there is a report of the Compliance Committee on the agenda for tomorrow, and if and when it is reached I am afraid that I can't avoid some repetition tomorrow of what I am saying today. All I am supposed to do is make a few introductory remarks, and then, when Jim Lynah has done the same, you are entitled to aim questions at both of us.

I spent most of my working life, actually, engaged in intercollegiate athletics, and I thought I knew something about them, but I shall have to admit that within the last two years my education has been developed to a considerable extent. Instead of my mail consisting of monthly bills and notices of overdrafts and requests for contributions, it has increased substantially as a result of this program.

I suppose we might consider at the outset what is the attitude of the colleges concerning the Code, concerning its adoption and concerning such steps as have been taken looking toward its enforcement.

You are here, and, of course, I can't speak for you. We can only say, as a committee, what you and your college presidents and others connected with intercollegiate athletics

have told us and try as best we can to summarize the attitudes of the institutions in connection with this movement.

This is on the optimistic side. There are some constructive points which I think we can state with reasonable certainty. When this Code was adopted and our group started to function with the Panel, I was extremely doubtful that the colleges would pay any attention to us. I felt somewhat timorous at writing college presidents and asking them to send us such things as lists of varsity and freshman football players with their academic standing and the amount of aid which they were receiving. I felt rather reluctant to write them when somebody sent in a complaint about their particular institution, and the other things that have gone along with it, and it has been difficult for us to advise institutions that in our opinion their program was not such as complied with the Code.

I shall have to say, however, that with very few exceptions the attitude of cooperation of the athletic directors and of the presidents of the colleges was stimulating to everyone. If we sent a questionnaire, or if we sent a letter asking for information, we got an immediate or a prompt reply, or a note that the information would be forthcoming as soon as it could be obtained. So your committee has in its files information about the athletic policies in every one of the 270 active member institutions of the Association.

This year, because of pressures and so forth, we were constrained to send another questionnaire. The Lord knows that college presidents and administrators suffer with requests for information, but at the time we left our offices for this meeting there was almost 100 per cent reply to that second questionnaire, which meant the digging out and the giving up of more information. Therefore, I say without fear of contradiction that the attitude of the institutions in the N.C.A.A. in this program is one of cooperation.

The next question might naturally be, what do they think about it? All we can say is what they tell us. I don't think there is any question but what there is terrific interest in this program that you have adopted, and there are a great many expressions to me, because I happen to be chairman, by presidents of colleges, by athletic directors, by letter and by personal visit. Some of them have thought it was important enough to come to the committee and meet with the committee, or its chairman, to discuss their problem.

Such statements as these are not unusual. "This movement has been too long delayed." "Intercollegiate athletics are out of hand." "These evils are snowballing." "Unless we have some place where we can go to look for support and for guidance in what is proper and what is improper, we think that something very difficult may confront us."

The college presidents themselves have never taken any particular action except in groups. I think it is fair to say that with the history of the N.C.A.A. as I knew it, it was a step which the N.C.A.A. had to take; the N.C.A.A. has taken it, and we are in it.

I suppose the next question which might be of interest to you is, what is the effect of this Code on the small institutions or the small colleges, as we call them? I have had a feeling that the effect so far as the small colleges curbing their activities is concerned was pretty inconsequential. I think if it has made a contribution to the small colleges it has been in another direction because, if our figures are accurate, 164 colleges in this Association have signified that they do not give, at least to their football players, any scholarships in excess of tuition and incidental fees. I have not much reason to doubt that statement, because I think it would be a matter of common knowledge because such a program is a terrifically expensive program.

When your committee found, as it did — and this was circulated among you although perhaps you did not pay any attention to it — the information furnished by some twenty-three colleges in this Association that they were obligated to protect their boys under existing contracts, it was found they were spending anywhere from \$25,000 to \$110,000 in one particular year on grants-in-aid to students participating in their football teams, and it sounded to me like a program which would be very unlikely to be followed by the institutions in this group; not particularly for any ethical reason, but for a financial reason.

So I think that so far as curbs are concerned the Code has caused little difficulty to you gentlemen. I could be wrong in that, but it hasn't come particularly to my attention.

It apparently has developed in this way: Many institutions have pressures — alumni groups, buck-a-month clubs, downtown quarterback clubs — who want to put some money in to help out a good halfback or a good tackle, and I suppose, from what college presidents and athletic directors tell me, they have been badgered by that kind of thing.

It has happened in a good many cases that those institutions have been able to say to these particular groups, "You can do this provided you turn that money over to the college, let it be administered by the regular agency in the college, let it be given out to athletes provided it is given on the basis of need and the other requirements of the institution."

That has served, I think, as a support to a good many institutions who were faced with awkward and embarrassing situations. There is no question about it.

There has been criticism of your Code and of the Association for, in principle, allowing and approving athletic

scholarships. I don't get very much excited about it because it seems to me that the Association has now recognized that intercollegiate athletics is an integral part of education and that a scholarship may be given for athletic ability if there is a ceiling on it, just as it has been given to debaters or musicians or students who engage in other extracurricular activities. In other words, in that particular respect I think it has tended to put the colleges on a sounder and more honest basis, particularly in our group.

Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid I have overstepped my time already, and I ought to give Jim Lynah a chance to talk, but I would like to say just one more word.

You have before you a very interesting issue that you are going to be asked to decide. I suppose we all hope that this issue may be kept upon a high plane. Our activities in this little committee have been conducted with college presidents and with athletic directors who are gentlemen and who have acted as such. Even though there may have been a difference of opinion between us, even though there may have been arguments, their attitude has been one, in almost all cases, of gentlemanliness in regarding this as an important issue, of meeting it in a way so that no matter what happens we are still acting in that capacity.

It is a fact that when you put into effect a law people will not pay any attention to that law unless something may happen to them, and for the first year of the existence of this Code our job was primarily an educational one, to get the members to be familiar with the provisions of the Code and with what the Code meant.

I think that has been accomplished. I think the members are reasonably familiar with the Code's important provisions. Now, of course, many members raise this simple question: When are you going to do something about it? When is this Code going to be enforced?

We have been pressed pretty hard by such statements as, when are you going to crack down on these people? We have held off and tried to follow an orderly procedure of giving these institutions a chance to furnish all the information they could, giving them a chance to tell their side of the story, and to encourage the institutions that have been found not in compliance to bring their institutions into compliance; and a majority of them have done that.

Herb, what do I do now, just sit down? I think I should.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I think at the end "Pop" pointed out one thing everybody should keep in mind, and that is that the Code has only been in operation two years, and a large part of that time has been involved in connection with education and orientation.

The man who is going to speak next, Jim Lynah, is chairman of the Panel Committee, which operates in cases where there are investigations to be made.

Jim Lynah, as you know, is a former executive of General Motors; later, for many years, director of athletics at Cornell. He now is giving most generously and unselfishly of his time to the N.C.A.A. because of his interest in intercollegiate sport.

I am happy that Jim can be here. Mr. James Lynah, Chairman of the Panel.

MR. LYNAH: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: I happen to be in this position because of my interest in restoring amateurism to intercollegiate athletics. I agree very heartily with President Stevenson when he says that it is perfectly possible for the small colleges to maintain a satisfactory intercollegiate program without any subsidization of athletes. It is just as possible for the large colleges to do the same thing, if their presidents want to do it.

You know perfectly well in any organization if the man charged with the responsibility of operating that organization lays down certain policies, his lieutenants and departments heads, etc., are committed to carrying out the policies of that organization. And when it is found that you have among your personnel those who don't carry out your policies, the thing to do is to make such changes in your personnel to insure your policies being put into effect.

Now, gentlemen, it is just that simple. I know that this question of alumni pressures is frequently brought up and discussed, and I think chiefly so because it is one of those very intangible things. Some seem to want to regard them as imponderables.

I don't feel that way about it at all. When I was invited to go back to Cornell some years ago as director of athletics, I returned with one understanding: that so far as carrying out the policies of the university were concerned (with which I was in accord) I wouldn't be interfered with in any way in the conduct of the athletic program.

I want to say to you gentlemen that at first I was exposed to the usual alumni pressures, so-called. My experience was that they didn't amount to much. You have a minority — and I think that is true in all of these institutions — that over-emphasizes certain phases of the athletic program. It isn't a large group. They make a lot of noise, and I think very frequently we are inclined to confuse noise with numbers, but the effect is not very far-reaching. It was my experience that the alumni who meant anything at all to the fortunes of their university were not the kind who interfered with the solid program and policies that the institutions were attempting to carry out.

I am going to make what may be a very provocative remark, but I feel very strongly about it. The chief cause of this whole trouble of subsidization in intercollegiate athletics is due to our coaches. They seem to feel that their stock in trade depends on winning football teams and that the easiest way to get a winning football team is to go out and find ready-made players regardless of what commitments have to be made to get them.

I think that is the big problem that the colleges have to deal with. I think the Sanity Code as it is today is too liberal, but at least we have a code as a starter in this effort to restore amateurism to intercollegiate athletics. I think any changes, any steps, that are taken to further liberalize the principles of that Code will be steps backward.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Gentlemen, the symposium is open now to questions that you can ask of either Mr. Lynah or "Pop" Houston in connection with the Sanity Code. They may not be able to answer all of them, but I think they can answer them if anyone can.

It is a real privilege to have these two men, who know more about the Code and its operation than any other two men connected with the N.C.A.A., so I'd like to have you start right off.

MR. DYCHE (Montana State College): When President Stevenson was talking and mentioned the large number of sports that they engage in, he said it was part of their educational program. In view of the fact that it's been mentioned that it should be supported as part of the educational program, in what light do they consider the student fees that are paid?

The students pay a fee for athletics at our place which is designed for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics. If we have a large fee, we will be able to do much more than a school that has a small fee.

Do the administrators call this a part of the educational budget?

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I don't know if that is right in line with the Code and the question we are discussing, but I would say that in this investigation President Stevenson spoke about, and also in other investigations that have been made, those student fees have been included in the educational budget.

They are included as a part of the educational funds, and that obligates an institution even more to use those funds for educational purposes. They are part of the fees the students pay for their education.

MR. HOUSTON: Is the question this: May those funds be used for the purpose of granting aids to athletes?

MR. DYCHE: No, not necessarily. I mean in the thinking of the committee and the thinking of everybody in general has that factor been considered. These fees are not standardized; they differ between many small colleges. Some institutions don't even have any; others have a pretty large one, which affects the nature of the program that you can put on and affects the nature of the schedules that you can make.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I might say that will be discussed, in the next topic that comes up, very carefully, the conducting of athletics independent of gate receipts.

MR. HENRICHES (Valparaiso University): Have any studies ever been made to show that the institutions which have a large intercollegiate athletic program and which are guilty, let's say, of all the sins about which we have been talking these days, do an inferior academic job to the institutions the like of which we have represented here to-day which, I am assuming, do not overemphasize athletics?

Some time ago I casually asked that question of some one and he said, 'I don't think any study has ever been made along that line.' At least he didn't know of any.

A few days later one of the schools in the Midwest celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary. That institution has a major program in football, in basketball and in all sports. Someone asked, "What's happened to the athletes of twenty-five years ago?" The surprising thing was that the athletes who were on the team twenty-five years ago, with the exception of about four out of thirty-six, had all done very well in their chosen work.

My question is this: Has any study ever been made to prove that the institutions which are really going out to put on a worth-while intercollegiate program, which also appeals to the public at large and which may be a money-maker for all of that, are they doing an inferior intellectual job so far as its students are concerned?

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Do you mean to say, are they doing an inferior intellectual job with those subsidized athletes, and have they followed all of those subsidized athletes through to determine whether they were as successful as the average student?

MR. HENRICHES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I would say that because an institution subsidizes is no reason at all why it may not be doing an excellent educational job with many, many students.

As you know, in all educational institutions there are all kinds of students. Some get a good education; some don't. But your question is whether there has ever been a study made to prove that men who spend a great deal of time in athletics, and maybe subsidized, are in any way affected in a bad way by that sort of thing; that is, whether there is a real distortion of values, whether they are less successful because of that.

Do you know, "Pop?" As far as I know, it could be done, possibly, but it would be very hard. Does anyone else care to speak on that? Does anyone know of any such study?

MR. HENRICHES: Mr. Chairman, after all, that is the basic question, isn't it: Are we doing the right thing by these youngsters if, when they come to our school, they devote a lot of time to sports? The fact that we give them a little help here or there, that isn't the great question, is it? I think the president of Oberlin was driving at something else. He was saying that the schools that do this sort of thing are not doing a good educational job by the young people who are entrusted to their care.

The two things are incompatible. You just can't put on a great intercollegiate athletic program and at the same time work for those values which we think educational institutions should stand for.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I think he did possibly indicate that there might be a distortion of values, and he knew that in many instances — at least in the mind of the public and in the minds of the students — a real distortion did exist as to what education is.

I don't think we can answer that.

MR. MARSH (Amherst College): I think that is a very interesting question, and I am wondering whether you are implying that you would like to make a study as to whether the academic life of that institution suffers because of the intercollegiate program.

As a part of that study, I would like to emphasize an aspect which I consider, as a director of physical education, one of the important educational procedures of the college.

I cannot answer the question as to studies. I can answer the question from certain personal observations. There is a tendency, when large sums of money are spent for the development of athletic teams, that from the point of view of physical education, the equal democratic opportunities for all students to get the same time and attention in coaching and facilities are neglected under a program which stresses the training of a relatively few men.

In most institutions, there would be one highly trained athlete for every five, six, eight or ten persons who need the training in skills, in development, in coordination from participation in rugged sports. Where you get a high degree of concentration on a relatively few persons, there is a tendency to neglect the great mass of boys who need that sort of thing which, from the point of a physical educator, I consider important educationally.

MR. TURNER (Johns Hopkins University): Mr. Houston made a point with respect to the effect of the Sanity Code on the smaller colleges and said that having the Sanity Code gave the presidents and the athletic directors a chance to say to alumni and other outside groups who might want to offer some particular aid to the athletic program that they couldn't because it would be contrary to the Code.

At Hopkins we have had discussions recently about the Sanity Code, and what it means to small colleges and to us in particular, and we had the feeling that perhaps the best thing to do was to eliminate the Code altogether and let each institution seek its own level in its athletic program. Let those who want to go into it go ahead and do it, and those who didn't want to go into it could go as far as they wanted to.

On that basis, they could seek their own level and meet competition they could meet equally. We feel that that would lead to a certain amount of honesty in the operation of their program. If the big-time teams would compete very strenuously for the top fellows — if they wanted to go that far — the smaller colleges would have to drop out and seek a lower level of activity.

I would like to know from your position, of having been in this so long, is it a reasonable stand that the Sanity Code, if dropped, would not lead to utter confusion and chaos in the picture?

MR. HOUSTON: Mr. Chairman, of course that is a \$64 question, and a very good one, I think.

We have been, have we not, through a period up until this action on the part of the Association without any such governing set of rules. During the conferences leading up to the adoption of these rules, the gist of the discussion was that unless some curbs are placed on the grants-in-aid given to students with athletic ability there would be what one college president described as an armament race by colleges for athletes around the country; that is, on the part of those colleges that want to engage in that kind of a program.

I believe some people think, "Well, why not let this be handled by the individual institutions and by the conferences? Let's not try to legislate about this thing."

I shall have to say that I felt considerable sympathy with that attitude, but I do find a desire on the part of many administrators of in-

stitutions to have some authority to determine what is proper and what is improper.

For instance, I asked a college president not long ago, "What do you college presidents think about this thing? Is it of any service to you?" His reply was very simple, "Oh, yes. There is a place where we can go and find out what people, who have given it consideration, think are proper practices and what they think are improper practices, and that serves as a good guide for us. We badly need it."

And it gives, as I think I tried to indicate to you before, support to the college administrators and to the athletic director.

You asked another question. Just assume for the moment what would happen if we stopped having a code, if we dropped the Sanity Code, or if it appears that there are no reasonable steps that the Association will take to enforce the Code. Where do we go from there? Well, I will answer this in another way, if I may, in terms of my own thinking.

This Code is a long-term program. Once having started it, if you stop it the reaction of the public, the reaction of the newspapers, will be very interesting, to say the least. It would be: The N.C.A.A. tried to do something about it, and decided that it couldn't

All efforts to prevent, to control, are out. They wouldn't mean a thing. There is that phase of it I think we have to consider.

Secondly, this kind of a law which involves large investments affects institutions which have a substantial income, have commitments to meet, perhaps, and they are very slow to take any steps which they think would jeopardize their position so far as the other institutions are concerned. For instance, they come and say, "Wait a minute. We are not going to go into this thing unless we are reasonably sure that the people with whom we compete are in it and are complying with it. We can't afford to do it otherwise."

They argue, I think, on the false assumption that the quality of their teams will drop. Of course it will drop in one sense, but I doubt that if all the institutions of the N.C.A.A. adapt their athletic programs to conform with the Code the quality of our football will change very much from what it is now.

That's beside the point. This program, so far as effectiveness is concerned, is a long-range program. It will take at least three, and I suspect five years if the Association goes along in an orderly way with discipline until there is an acceptance by the organization of this Code. It may be a compromise, to be sure, but as it is changed we hope it is bettered.

After all, this is in large part a self-disciplining. I don't think any committee of this Association ought to, except in extreme cases where there is a necessity to investigate, lay down how the intercollegiate athletics should be carried on in an institution in compliance with the Code. We can all read, and we can all see what it says. It appears to be reasonable and clear, but it will take another couple of years before there is, in my opinion, any general acceptance of the Code and real compliance with it because, say what you want to, I suspect many institutions are playing a waiting game to see whether or not this Code is going to be adopted.

If it goes out, I wouldn't dare prophesy what would happen. Some people have given it considerable thought and say that probably it may mean an end to intercollegiate football. One college president told me that he wished his institution would drop intercollegiate football, the problem was so terrific at his particular institution and the outside pressures were so great, and this was the only chance he saw of saving it. Whether that is so or not, you know just as well as I do.

I hope that has answered your question.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: We have here another member of the Compliance Committee present, Ralph Aigler of the University of Michigan. He doesn't represent a small college, but he certainly represents a pertinent point of view, and he has additionally the point of view of the big institution. It might be interesting to have a word from Ralph in regard to how he feels about the Code. We are glad to have him here, and I would like to have him say a word, if he will.

MR. AIGLER (University of Michigan): Mr. Chairman, I will take only a very few minutes because I came in here to listen and not to talk. An institution with 21,000 students certainly can't qualify for a really legitimate presence in this gathering.

There have been two things suggested here on which I would like to say just a word or two, and one is the last question as to what would happen if we didn't have any Code. In fact, I took it almost as a suggestion that it might be better if we didn't have any. Perhaps the speaker didn't mean to imply quite that much, but at least it bore that possible construction.

That reminded me that in the field of economics generally there is a theory or program which might be called laissez-faire—do as you please, in other words.

As I understand it, there never really has been 100 per cent laissez-faire any place because since we have had any kind of organized society there have always been limitations placed upon what people may do because people's interests and desires overlap, and if you are going to get along at all some restraints have got to be imposed, and they always have been. The only variation has been in the degree of controls that are imposed upon these individuals and groups whose desires overlap.

Certainly, in the field of intercollegiate athletics we have a situation in which desires and interests overlap. It seems to me just as it is natural in the law of economics — generally the law of the state and the law of the nation — that restraint should be imposed upon what corporations, individuals and groups of people may do, in the interest of others having a fair chance to work out their problems and their desires. So it seems to me perfectly natural that there should be a similar sort of process in the field of intercollegiate athletics.

We do not find in the legislature of our individual states, or in Congress, a body that sets those limits, those restraints, in the field of intercollegiate athletics. But we do have an Association, and that is the Association that is meeting here.

The Association has assumed the function of legislation. It is a recent development, as you all know. I think it was inevitable, because the increasing complexity of our problems has demonstrated that it was necessary.

Now, if we just simply go back to the law of the jungle and wipe out all the rules—well, my imagination, fertile as it is, isn't equal to picturing what the situation would be.

I don't think that we are going to have a perfect administration of this Code. I don't know of any system of laws—and I happen to be a lawyer with a good many years of experience—that is enforced 100 per cent. We are always going to have violations of our Code.

Let me say this: As we learned from the "noble experiment," as President Hoover called it, of prohibition, unless you have a very substantial segment of your people really interested in the enforcement of the law, you aren't going to have it enforced.

So I think about this Sanity Code, if we are going to have any considerable percentage of the membership of this organization that is going to take the position, "We are going to do what we can to beat it," we might just as well throw up our hands.

I am not pessimistic enough to think that that is the way it is going to go. After all, we are not dealing here, it seems to me, with the criminal class. The membership of this Association is made up of universities and colleges, and the human beings who come here to represent those educational institutions, are a specially selected group. I hate to think that men of that type can't take hold of a project like this, put their shoulders to the wheel, and say, "We are going to make this thing work." And I would leave here tomorrow night with more than a little chagrin if I had to say to myself as I got on the plane to leave New York, "It's been demonstrated that this selected group simply can't establish a set of rules and see to it that they are enforced with reasonable measure of efficiency."

And I say "reasonable," not 100 per cent, because you never will be able to get that.

There is another point about which I would like to say and that concerns the interesting question asked as to whether any studies have been made upon the effect of intercollegiate programs on intellectual measurements of the students.

The answer is "no." At least I never heard of such a study, and nobody else seems to have heard of one. It would be an interesting thing if you could get a dependable report on that basis, but I don't think you will ever get it because a study might be made that will indicate that institution A, with a larger intercollegiate athletic program, is turning out an inferior intellectual product, on the average, than institution B; but how are you ever going to tell that that difference is due to the fact that institution A has a larger intercollegiate athletic program than institution B?

You raised some question about what happens to the young men who take part in intercollegiate athletics. That has interested me for many years. For over thirty years, I have been participating in intercollegiate athletics not as a technical person, because my work is in the Law School, but as an avocation. I have had a lot of fun out of it, and I have been tremendously interested in finding out about things.

The boys who are members of athletic teams are extremely interesting to me, and I like to have them come to me and talk over their programs academically and athletically, and even talk over their love affairs.

Scattered over these United States there are literally hundreds, yes, thousands, of men whom I have known as members of Michigan athletic teams. I like to follow their careers. I can't follow all of them, of course.

say, twenty, twenty-five and thirty-five years ago—a long enough time that they have had a chance to demonstrate what they could ac-

I have gone back and gotten the list of varsity football teams of, accomplish.

I find that very few of them stayed in athletics for any length of time. What are they doing? They are businessmen—many of them very successful businessmen—lawyers, engineers, doctors and teachers. I am proud to say that, so far as my own study has gone, their accomplishments in terms of success as we usually measure it stands up just about as well (and perhaps just a little bit higher) than the average of the graduates generally.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Thank you very much, Mr. Aigler.

MR. TURNER: I appreciated that point of view, but I didn't mean to say that Johns Hopkins isn't interested in the development of intercollegiate athletics, because we are.

I think I am stating the feelings of 90 per cent of the institutions who conduct their athletics along the lines outlined by President Stevenson, when I say that the practices mentioned in the Sanity Code in

no way touch the activities of the small school. So we didn't think the Sanity Code had any effect on the practices of intercollegiate athletics for the smaller schools.

That may be incorrect, but that is the way we felt. That is why I didn't see why we, as a small college group, are particularly interested in the Sanity Code.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Ralph Aigler's question brings up one thing. At Reed College in Oregon there has never been any intercollegiate athletics. Investigations show that they had more men who were what is called men of science than any other college student body of the United States, they had more Rhodes scholars than any other college in the United States, they had more men in "Who's Who," according to their percentage of students, than any other college in the United States.

Now, that does not indicate it is a conclusive study because, as was said, those things are practically impossible to judge—whether those men are more successful because they attended a college that did not participate in any intercollegiate athletics.

MR. GREGG (University of the South): I'd like to say this: We have a situation here in the smaller college group which I think is most important to bring up at this time. To find out where the men go, what the men develop into, as Mr. Aigler has brought out, is a very tough problem.

The way to determine whether an institution is doing good in general society is to determine whether their graduates are becoming bankers, lawyers, or whatever the groups are.

The smaller college group has another situation to contend with. At Sewanee we have tried to play, since the war, a simon-pure brand of football.

Now, considering subsidization and the subject of the Sanity Code, there are only two features. There are only two ways to go about this. You either do it or you don't. You either violate the Sanity Code 100 per cent or you do as we have done at Sewanee, where we are absolutely simon-pure, regardless of the Sanity Code.

A year and a half before the Sanity Code came into effect, we decided that the only way for us to have athletics at Sewanee was to have them simon-pure. We have played a number of institutions. We have based it on whether they were doing the same things we were doing.

You have large institutions. Mr. Aigler represents a large institution. Regardless of what Mr. Aigler's institution does — and they say they are within the Sanity Code — we say, and I think we can prove, and we have witnesses to prove, that we are within the Sanity Code.

The point is this: There are two ways. You either do it or you don't do it. You are strictly simon-pure, or you are not simon-pure. I think Citadel's Colonel McAllister stated the point very aptly yesterday when he said that a man cannot go to The Citadel, take military training, get an education, and still become an athlete. It can't be done according to the Sanity Code.

Athletics are a great thing. Mr. Aigler has said that he has followed with great interest the fortunes of various Michigan athletes. I would say that we have followed with great interest the careers of some of our athletes, and they have done just as well, in fact maybe better, than some of our chemistry majors, some of our history majors and some of our English majors. They have done a beautiful job. They have filled their station in life.

I once attended a preparatory school called Western Reserve Academy, where the headmaster got to the point where he believed the

only way for admissions was to have students who believed that scholarship was the only thing; athletics meant nothing. Within three years that whole system was changed because the men who make up the United States are not all wizards, are not all geniuses. Maybe I'm wrong, but I say it takes all kinds of people to make a world, and I think that is very true even today. Those people must be well-balanced, well-rounded folks, whether they are cotton brokers, whether they are merchants, lawyers, or anything else; they must be good, honest-to-goodness people.

The Sanity Code has completely neglected this particular phase. Johns Hopkins has brought up a good point. Mr. Turner has pointed out, I think, that the institution alone should be the guide. I think that is a very good thing, because the problems of your institution, Mr. Houston's institution, or various other institutions, have certain local circumstances, certain local controls, which must be decided.

Mr. Robinson here, from Mississippi College, has certain problems which are problems that he must overcome, and what may be his solution may not be allowed under the Sanity Code. The Sanity Code is so made up that you are either white or black, and that is not true; it can't be. I think that is impossible.

MR. JOHN ORR (Westminster College): I represent one of those institutions which hasn't been majoring in purity. I came to Westminster College in May. Some of the first letters that came across my desk were addressed to the Acting President of the college, and knowing not yet the difference between the dormitory and the science building on the campus, I asked him to prepare an answer for my signature.

I found that Westminster College was not in compliance with the Code. On investigation, I found that we are out of line in giving room rent. And so we began to investigate, and everything in the world at Westminster College seemed to point to bringing that college into full and complete compliance with the Sanity Code.

There was a time some few years ago, in a city not very far from here, when a group met representing thirteen small, badly organized so-called colleges. They got together and said, "If we get together, we will be strong." They got together, and we have inherited that strength.

Representing one of these institutions not having majored, sir, in purity, I want to say that as long as I am President of Westminster College, Westminster College is going to bring herself into line with this Code, because we think, and firmly believe, this to be one of the finest things that could ever happen to either the small or to the large institutions of higher learning.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Thank you very much, President Orr.

MR. GREGG: May I say one thing in rebuttal — if it is in rebuttal?

The institution I represent has done as much, if not more (with the possible exception of Johns Hopkins) than any other institution to go along with purity. And the University of the South was a member of the old S.I.A.A., it was an original member of the Southern Conference, it ran the gamut of professionally subsidized athletics.

Sewanee ran through anything there was to go through, and Sewanee came to the conclusion in 1946, upon the closing of World War II, that the only way a small college could operate in athletics was strictly simon-pure.

Sewanee figures on losing \$25,000 a year on football. They figure on paying a full coaching staff. They figure on paying a coaching staff upon the same basis that they would figure on paying the staff of a department of history, a department of chemistry, or any other department. And until such time that a small college, or any college, can believe that its athletic department rates in the same category with

its educational departments, the colleges are in a mess. And until such time as the colleges are able to afford to put down a certain amount of money, regardless of gate receipts, colleges are going to be in for trouble, and real trouble.

We don't believe in paying anybody. We don't believe in giving anybody a scholarship. But we do believe that athletics have a definite part in the educational process.

We hire the best coaches we can get. We pay the highest amount of money we can pay for them. We buy the finest equipment we can buy from the best companies. We do feel that in doing that we have the right to go out and try to sell students on coming to our institution. If that is a violation of the Sanity Code, then it is a violation, but our athletes have to compete for scholarships the same way anybody else does; they have to put their names in and do the best they can. If they make it, they make it; if they don't make it, it's just too bad.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I want to say that I know Mr. Lynah and Mr. Houston recognize the contribution that Sewanee has made, and the contribution that your president has made. Mr. Lynah has said they felt it was the finest factual statement that had been put out in support of the type of ideal that you have expressed and that we all have expressed.

MR. WALTER G. LIVINGSTON (Denison University): I would just like to ask the gentleman from Sewanee where he would find his competition were it not for the Sanity Code.

MR. GREGG: We would find people who were trying to do the same job we are, and find enough of them.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I question that you would find enough without the Sanity Code.

MR. GREGG: We had them before the Sanity Code. We played a full schedule before the Sanity Code with people who were doing the same job we did.

MR. JOHN S. MERRIMAN (U.S. Coast Guard Academy): Assuming that the Compliance Committee controls the use of the money that a college has for its athletics, so to speak, does the Code limit, or is it concerned at all with, the boy that an alumni group chose to send to that college, if that boy happens to be an outstanding athlete?

MR. HOUSTON: Your question is that if a group of alumni send a young man to an institution and he plays on an athletic team, does he lose his eligibility?

Of course, the answer is that he does. You recall that the Code says that the only outside aid he may receive outside of those upon whom he is legally or naturally dependent is aid given by the regular agency in the college and administered by the college. Therefore, clearly and technically such a young man would be ineligible under the provisions of the Code.

MR. MERRIMAN: Although the college had nothing to say about the awarding of the scholarship by a particular group?

MR. HOUSTON: That is another very interesting question. You talk about alumni aid and what can you do about that. The effort thus far has been directed at the institution for the institution to bring its policies and its program into accordance with the Code and to give aid to athletes in accordance with the Code.

I think perhaps you are asking this question: How is the college going to know about that particular boy?

Obviously, it is very difficult. If the college has no knowledge of it, nobody ever finds out anything about it, none of the competitors find out anything about it and nothing is said, why, you know as well as I do what the answer to that would be. It does happen, and has happen-

ed, that that kind of thing has been discovered in some cases. Whether or not the institution knew about it has yet to be determined. Of course that sort of thing goes on, and how commonly I don't know. I don't think anybody knows just how much of it there is.

My own experience with alumni aid has been that the effort to obtain money from the alumni for the purpose of athletic scholarships has not always been successful. In some institutions, however, it is successful, and loyalty funds, have developed. Those institutions we know about have been able to get control of those funds and have them given out by the scholarship committee in the particular institutions to the athletes in question which is, of course, not a violation of the Code.

Does that answer your question?

MR. MERRIMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Are there other questions at this time? We would like to move along to the next panel.

MR. HAINES (Drexel Institute of Technology): I'd like to have a definition of what the place of the small college is in the Sanity Code discussion. Is there some effort to whip up religious fervor to make the large universities comply? I don't think we have much of a problem. I know that in my own institution the conduct of athletics costs money — we are in the hole every year — and the operation of the Sanity Code is no problem to us.

I would really like to know, if only to carry back to my own institution, what is the place of the small college in this whole program? I feel a good deal of sympathy towards Johns Hopkins. It's like the fellow trying to get out the vote of the irresponsible citizen. We really haven't worried much about it. Maybe we should. But if we should, why?

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I leave that to Mr. Houston to answer, but I think it is the same obligation you have to society in general.

MR. HOUSTON: In addition to that, I suspect your institution does not have a problem which has come to our attention in a good many cases and about which, as I recall it, there was considerable discussion at the time of the drafting of this Code.

It appeared to be a fact, and it still does, that the smaller colleges, the colleges with the least funds, were considerably bothered by the fact that boys they believed would naturally come to their institution by reason of family affiliation, by reason of location, or any other reason, were taken away from those smaller institutions and were attracted to the institutions with more funds because they would get substantial scholarships.

I am not talking so much about athletes, although athletes have been involved. There have been many complaints about that practice, and the feeling on the part of small institutions is that that is unfair to them. That is one reason, I suppose, that when this Code was drafted it put a top on the amount of money, the amount of scholarships, that could be given to a boy because of athletic ability by any institution.

I am a little surprised that you have not experienced that problem. Perhaps you are not concerned with that, but apparently a good many smaller institutions have been concerned in the past.

We have had a good many instances of boys being attracted to an institution with substantial scholarships. Some of these big schools have what they call national scholarships. There is real money in them — \$1000, \$1200, \$1400 a year. They exceed tuition. We have been asked to look into them.

Of course, the question simply is, upon what basis was that scholarship granted? We put those institutions to the trouble of furnishing

us with photostatic copies of the preparatory school or high school record to see whether, in our opinion, they coincided with the high scholarship requirements of the Code. That, I think, is one of the factors which appears to be of considerable interest to the small colleges.

MR. MALCOLM E. MORRELL (Bowdoin College): It seems to me one other answer might be this. First of all, we are all members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. We all are concerned with athletic programs. When some of the large colleges go out and make themselves into football institutions and football is criticized we are all tarred with that same brush no matter how decent our programs may be.

It seems to me that is a very good reason why we should be interested in what is going on in the athletic programs throughout the country.

MR. VAN WYLE (Wittenberg College): Mr. Chairman, what I have to say I hope will not be misinterpreted, because many in this room know I am highly in favor of the Sanity Code. As a matter of fact, I attended the first meeting, in Chicago, where it had its inception.

I am virtually concerned about something, and I have not found an answer yet. What will happen if an alumnus, or a group of alumni, decides there is a worthy boy who needs help in going to college and, without pursuing the proper channels of giving the college that money to be dispersed through the normal procedure, helps this boy and he develops into quite a star and, when he becomes a junior or a senior, the truth is known. I am fearful that when the truth becomes known, it will be the responsibility of the athletic director to declare this individual ineligible.

I do not believe the difference between right and wrong is whether you get caught. I am definitely against any kind of legislation which has little possibility of being enforced or which can't be enforced, and I fail to see how you can tell an individual what he may or should do with his money. If the college isn't involved in any way in acquiring that grant for that boy, I can see no way in which the college is guilty, but the Sanity Code says it is, and says the boy must be punished.

I am vitally concerned with that, and I haven't found an answer yet.

MR. HOUSTON: There is no question but what that is a very awkward and difficult problem on behalf of the institution, its president and its athletic director if it happens; all I can say is so far that has not seemed to be the major problem in this whole picture.

The major problem, so far as the N.C.A.A. is concerned, is to have the institutions conduct their programs in accordance with the provisions of the N.C.A.A. Code. You may say that is side-stepping the issue. What I mean is to get their own scholarship program in accordance with the Code, to see that the aid which they hand out is handed out in the same way to all students, to bring into their possession funds which have otherwise been given discriminatorily or, possibly, not as well as the institution can distribute them.

You have a difficult problem in this thing, and that problem is the education of the public and the education of the alumni. I think it is pretty fair to say that at the outset the sportswriters and the newspaper writers looked upon this thing as just another gesture and thought that it wouldn't amount to anything, and the syndicated articles and the large magazine articles poked fun at it. In other words, if I were an alumnus, such as you speak of, I would have said, "It does not amount to anything," and pay no attention to it.

That situation, as I see it, has somewhat been changed. The public now accepts the Code as being an instrument of some importance. I don't say that the sportswriters or the magazine writers are friendly

toward it, or enthused about it, but there is more general acceptance of it in the press even though some of the newspaper articles are still cynical in their references to it.

You have to get the public educated, which is a long process, so that if an alumnus has the money and wants to educate a boy who is not his own he will say to himself, "Now, wait a minute. There's such a thing as a Code. Maybe before I pay that boy's way I should go down to the school and find out how I can do it in accordance with the Code."

In some of the groups of institutions they have conducted almost inquisitions of the other institutions with reference to the boys on their athletic teams to see where the money was coming from. The parents and the friends of the boys in those institutions that I know about are conscious of that fact. You have to come to the time when a man wanting to help a boy realizes that maybe by doing it he might get the boy in trouble and he better go down to the institution and see how this can be done and not violate any of the rules of the institution or any of the rules which they may be governed by.

MR. HAINES: We tried for four or five years to meet the problem by having all of the boys who registered for competition in intercollegiate athletics fill in a card on which they were asked to disclose the source of all moneys, including scholarships, except those on which they were naturally dependent for support. We found a few instances disclosed, and we also found in every one of those cases that where those moneys were supposedly surreptitiously passed, it was through the knowledge and connivance of the coach.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: We will have to move on to the next topic. The next topic ties right in with this. I am going to ask that panel to come up here.

I want to thank Mr. Lynah and Mr. Houston very much for their contributions. If you'd like to talk with them, they will be here later.

The next topic is the conduct of intercollegiate athletics independent of gate receipts. That does not mean the elimination of gate receipts, but it does mean conducting them through the use of educational funds.

As Johns Hopkins happens to be the only institution I know of in the United States, with the possible exception of the University of Chicago and Reed College, that is conducting its intercollegiate athletics entirely independent of gate receipts, and has had that project for twelve or thirteen years, I am going to ask its representative to say a word about that.

There are many colleges that conduct their intercollegiate athletics entirely dependent on gate receipts or partially on gate receipts, but there are a few colleges that have eliminated them entirely. Johns Hopkins is one. That was done in 1937, I believe. I now present Mr. Turner of Johns Hopkins, who is the director of intercollegiate athletics there.

MR. TURNER: I am very happy to be here this afternoon on behalf of Johns Hopkins University to explain how and why we operate our intercollegiate program. Dr. Nichols is very anxious to turn this into a discussion period as soon as possible, but in the hopes that we might save a little time later in answering questions, I would like to explain briefly some of the outlines and background of this program. I also hope it will give you an opportunity to think of some detailed questions you might want to ask.

We have an intercollegiate athletic program at Hopkins because we feel that it meets the needs and interests of a segment of our student body. There are those boys who have superior physical equipment, and this program meets their needs in much the same way that we have

a special academic program for those of our students who are particularly gifted intellectually.

The lessons of teamwork, cooperation, effort and sportsmanship, all elements of a successful democracy, are of course available to students in the intramural and required physical education programs, but can be particularly available to those in the intercollegiate program. The values for good mental and physical health as a result of the activities, and the social and emotional outlets, are very important.

We also believe it is a desirable thing to have the non-varsity student number among his friends and fellow students the varsity athlete, who is anxious for, and working toward, the same cultural and educational objectives as he himself is. This relationship is, of course, mutually beneficial.

For these reasons in particular, Johns Hopkins will present as many intercollegiate teams as there is a demand for, within the limitations of our facilities, and as long as we can find suitable competition for them.

Prior to the year 1934-35, the intercollegiate athletic program at Hopkins was operated by an Athletic Association, as was the common procedure at many institutions. This group was composed of alumni only, with no faculty or student representatives, and the program consisted of one varsity team in each of six sports. The Athletic Association hired the coaching staffs, arranged all schedules, paid for game and traveling expenses, and bought and maintained all uniforms and equipment. Funds to operate this program came from gate receipts, guarantees, and a \$10 student athletic fee, which was collected by the University and turned over to the Athletic Association.

The University hired a director of the Department of Physical Education, who served on the Athletic Association, but who was primarily responsible for conducting a two-year required physical education program. This program consisted of calisthenics given for a few minutes outdoors in an open field, if the weather permitted. The director was given a small amount of money to hire an assistant to conduct these calisthenics, and he usually secured an assistant varsity coach who had already been hired by the Athletic Association.

In the year 1934, as a result of general dissatisfaction with the type and operation of the programs outlined above, Dr. Joseph S. Ames, President of Johns Hopkins University, asked for an entire reorganization under the leadership of Dr. C. Wilson Shaffer, who was made the chairman of the department for that purpose. As a result of the reorganization, the Athletic Association was abolished, although the contracts for coaches and games for that year were honored. Intercollegiate football was to be dropped in 1935, but this, however, was not done. Other changes included the addition of more intercollegiate sports, the institution of a broad intramural program, and the development of a more intelligently planned required physical education program. The financing of all these activities was achieved through the collection of gate receipts, some few reciprocal guarantee agreements, and a University appropriation to make up the balance. The \$10 student athletic fee, as well as all laboratory and other fees, was absorbed by the University in a slightly higher tuition charge.

During the next year or two, there was a growing feeling on the part of many people that the extreme commercialism and resulting pressure on intercollegiate athletics, especially football, was getting to be too serious a problem to ignore any longer. The University felt that the elimination of any income in the form of gate receipts or guarantees would remove any reason to schedule so-called big-time opponents for the large guarantees, or to subsidize and pressure your players, in order to have the winning team necessary to insure adequate gate receipts.

If intercollegiate athletics have any value other than monetary, they should be financed by the University, and controlled by the University so as to secure the educational and not the monetary values. Accordingly, in 1937, Johns Hopkins began making all their schedules on a home-and-home basis with no exchange of guarantees, and eliminated all admission charges for home athletic contests, establishing a system of guest cards in its place.

There are, I think, two points to be clarified in the statements just made. First, the removal of the necessity of having winning teams does not mean that we believe in losing games. On the contrary, we believe that the values mentioned earlier do not accrue to regularly losing teams. Continued failure is educationally unsound, as you all know. We intend to win every game that we can, but we don't have to win in order to get the money for a wrestling team the following year, or to be sure that the students and alumni will continue their interest in the teams.

The second point to be made clear is that we do not feel that the elimination of gate receipts is a completely interdependent part of our intercollegiate program. The University will not permit any other type of program, regardless of how it might be financed. I'm sure there are other colleges and universities that have intercollegiate programs very similar to ours, but who make some admission charge. However, since their receipts are so small, their financial problems are just as difficult as ours. Our only purpose in eliminating guarantees and gate receipts is to remove any reason, or even the slightest temptation, to conduct our intercollegiate athletic program other than for the educational values therein.

Since 1937 then, the University has completely financed the Department of Physical Education and Athletics. The same type program as begun in 1934, with its aims and objectives, is still being carried on today, expanded to meet the needs of a larger number of students, and now under the direction of Mr. William F. Logan, Chairman of the Department, since 1947.

The University has expressed itself as being satisfied with the program which has been established. It wishes to note particularly that there has never been any intention of de-emphasizing athletics, as witnessed by the increased number of sports, teams, participants and facilities. The University agrees that there is a definite place for intercollegiate athletics in the total school program, but only if conducted along the essential lines which have been mentioned. On that basis, the University will continue to support, to its utmost ability, intercollegiate athletics.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I will now ask Mr. Nelson T. Metcalf of the University of Chicago, to say a few words, because the University of Chicago is actually conducting their athletics on a very similar basis.

MR. METCALF: Gentlemen, I'd like to say, first, that I have always believed the right kind of a physical education program makes an important contribution to general education and that, as such, it deserves support directly from educational funds.

I fervently believe that the best type of varsity athletic program is an important, integral part of any general physical education program and, therefore, it also should be financed as a part of the general program from educational funds.

I will have to say this about varsity sports, however. I doubt if this is true when the situation is one in which the primary emphasis in the varsity program is on commercial entertainment, when they are conducted primarily for financial return, or just to provide an entertaining spectacle or to add to the prestige of the institution. I think

that your intercollegiate athletic program deserves a place in the educational program when the athletic policies are determined exclusively on the basis of what is best for those who play.

When I came to the University of Chicago seventeen years ago, I had an opportunity to ask for that kind of a setup, and I got it; and I have never been sorry. I asked for a centralized department, a centralized budget, and that gate receipts be entirely divorced from athletic expenditures.

The first seven years I was there, we continued varsity football in the Big Ten Conference, but it made no difference whether we took in \$175,000 at the gate or \$30,000, we had the same budget to operate on. That gate receipt money went into the general fund of the University. We couldn't spend a cent of it. We operated exclusively on the appropriation from educational funds. The advantage of that, to my mind, was that I was not forced to make money schedules; I could schedule the contests which were best for the teams that we had.

A couple of years before we discontinued varsity football in the Conference, we adopted the policy of having free admissions to all students for all sports. A few years later, we extended that to everyone connected with the University — faculty, employees, students and their families.

At present, we have negligible gate receipts. We do charge a small admission to basketball games purely for the convenience of controlling the crowd. If we weren't located in a large city, I doubt if we would do that. We may go to the Hopkins plan of guest tickets, but at present it seems more convenient to charge the public, those people who have absolutely no connection with the University, a small fee.

It is hard for me to tell you what our varsity athletics are costing us because of the fact that we have just a single budget. I have a budget of approximately \$65,500 for instruction. That takes care of thirteen people on my staff, plus a few part-time instructors. These thirteen men handle the required and elective programs, supervise the voluntary participation, supervise the intramural athletics, coach and administer the varsity athletics.

We do not have varsity football, but we do have a very extensive program of teams playing outside the University. Figured up, last year we had forty teams in sixteen different sports. Twenty-seven of those were formal varsity and junior varsity and "B" teams which were fully equipped and received intensive coaching, so that it is a considerable program of varsity competition. The other dozen sports were informal club teams which didn't have a great deal of coaching and didn't in all cases have complete equipment and supervision provided them.

The additional budget we have to operate on is approximately \$75,000 in service, expense and equipment budgets given to us in a lump sum to operate the entire program on. I can't break down accurately the percentage of that that is devoted to our varsity program, but it is somewhere around \$20,000 that it costs us to operate our varsity program, exclusive of office expense, instruction and care of grounds and buildings. I will leave anything else you want to know to questions from you.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I've also got Malcolm Morrell of Bowdoin on this panel, because he represents an institution which, while receiving some gate receipts, is carrying on the athletic program as a part of the educational program with gate receipts being a minor consideration and having no consideration as far as the educational policy is concerned.

We gave out questionnaires to all of you because of the fact that Mr. Morrell and the college of Bowdoin is conducting a survey to determine just what intercollegiate football, and just what intercol-

legiate sports, costs and would cost an institution, and how much of the cost is borne by gate receipts, how much by student activities fees, how much by educational funds.

The survey that President Stevenson spoke about was of twenty-two representative colleges and, as you know, it reported practically none of those colleges making money from intercollegiate sports. The instruction was paid for, and the maintenance was carried on, by the college. Practically all expenses were carried on by the college, except for the trips and equipment, which usually came from a small amount of gate receipts.

MR. MALCOLM MORRELL: I told Dr. Nichols that I wouldn't make a speech. He asked me to be here, I think, because I said that I was in favor of gate receipts as long as the search for gate receipts made no difference at all in the college policy.

I remember in New Orleans some twelve months ago at a small college meeting there were eighty-two colleges represented. During the meeting, the question was asked, "How many of those represented institutions made money in football?" There were just two that had. I remember that Lafayette had had an undefeated season that year and had made several hundred dollars; I forgot the name of the other institution.

I think that most of the colleges here represented have integrated athletic programs with your staff members on the faculty and with all moneys collected going to the college bursar or treasurer; you operate on budgets made up by boards of the college and you can spend what has been appropriated for you for sports, regardless of what you take in in gate receipts or guarantees.

We are getting away from guarantees as much as we can, but we do take in a fair amount in gate receipts. We never break even in any sport, but that amount of money that comes in in gate receipts goes to the bursar, does not affect the budget. We think there are two reasons for taking in that money: It makes it less necessary for the college to appropriate money from endowed funds; and it does give us some control at the gate.

As far as basketball is concerned, where some institutions make a pretty good thing out of gate receipts, we do not admit the public. We hardly have enough seats for our own students and faculty. But in football, we do have gate receipts. We have played the same schedule of games for a long, long time and hope to continue with the same institutions we are playing. We play seven games. We don't do advertising in newspapers or on the radio, or anything like that. We put up posters for the general convenience of those who want to come, noting when the games are to be played, where and at what time.

We are aiming, of course, as most of you probably are, at the same ideals that Johns Hopkins is aiming at in doing away with the gate receipts and taking the other steps they have taken. I still believe that \$15,000, \$16,000 taken in in football gate receipts, besides giving us control of the thing, is not a bad thing.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Will you please shoot questions at these men or bring up anything you may want to.

MR. GEIGER (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): Even though some of these questions probably will appear to be a little bit personal, in directing them to Mr. Turner, I think that nevertheless they are of wide enough scope and area — the answers are of wide enough scope and area — so that they will be of more or less interest to all of you.

M.I.T. also sponsors its entire athletic program without gate receipts, with the exception of possibly \$3000 or \$4000, a very large portion of which represents cancellation of guarantees, and we do, be-

cause of commercial aspects involved in the hockey rinks in Boston, get a kick-back of about enough money to pay for our ice time.

There are a few questions in my mind, and I'd like to direct them to Mr. Turner. The first question I have to ask is, what is your student undergraduate enrollment?

MR. TURNER: This year it's been 1600. The highest it has been since the war is 1750. The average before the war was 850. It was 850 when we went into this program.

MR. GEIGER: What is the proportion of graduate enrollment to that?

MR. TURNER: I think there are about 600 graduate students at the present time.

MR. GEIGER: And your total expenditure for your intercollegiate athletic and recreation program is what?

MR. TURNER: It is just under \$50,000. That does not include the budget for maintenance of the buildings and grounds. That is for instructional staff and equipment.

MR. GEIGER: And you mentioned also that you had a \$10 student fee which you collected. Is that per year or per semester?

MR. TURNER: That fee was dropped in 1934 and absorbed by the University.

MR. GEIGER: Now it is absorbed?

MR. TURNER: In the tuition charges. I think "lab" fees and all other fees were absorbed.

MR. GEIGER: In how many intercollegiate sports do you participate?

MR. TURNER: At the present time I think we have twelve.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: In how many do you participate?

MR. GEIGER: Seventeen; and there are about thirty-six representative varsity, freshman and junior varsity teams.

If it is interesting at all to understand how we do operate, our setup is very much like the one at the University of Chicago in that we have approximately \$50,000 collected from the students as a result of students' fees, \$4.00 per semester, 5000 students; taking into consideration the graduate students pay as much as the undergraduates, that brings a total of \$40,000. Then from endowments we have another income that brings it up to approximately \$50,000.

We turn this over to the undergraduate Athletic Association, and we delegate responsibility to the undergraduates in the administration of these funds. They go toward the payment of transportation of the teams, meals, etc., and I must say the students do have control of this large amount of funds.

The other budget, like the University of Chicago's, of another \$50,000 is in my control, and covers the salaries for ten full-time men and a number of part-time men. The rest of the budget deals with maintenance of grounds and boat-houses and gymnasiums, etc. That, of course, is doled out by the university.

The question in my mind is this: Do they give you a flat budget to operate on per year, or are you asked to list your needs for the coming year and they meet it without a protest? I know that thus far we have listed our needs and they have met them without kicking too much, but my hair is getting a little thin — I am no longer the fair-haired boy, I think — and they are going to begin to cut back. I am wondering if you are running into the same problems.

I know as long as we keep the program on a high educational level the funds are going to keep rolling in, but I am a little concerned

about how you men feel about the possibilities of expansion at your school. Our total program last year cost us just a shade better than \$250,000 — the total expenditure for all athletics and physical education — of which absolutely nothing more than \$40,000 came from the students themselves, and that was not in additional fees. That is absorbed in the regular tuition fee.

Would you answer that question?

MR. TURNER: The only thing I can say, from hearsay, is that our budget has been maintained at the same level for the last three years, and other department budgets have been decreased in some cases by as much as 15 and 20 per cent.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: You have held your budget?

MR. TURNER: Yes. Our budget has been within \$1000 of the same amount for the last three years.

MR. GEIGER: Mr. Metcalf, is that true with you? This is an interesting thing to me. All departments last year, with the exception of the Athletic Department, took a 10 per cent reduction. If it happened to the University of Chicago, we must have something there.

MR. METCALF: We have our troubles and our battles in connection with our budget. I think that in general over the years we have been treated pretty liberally. Our instruction budget has gone up continually, but not as fast as I'd like to have it go up. I think we have a number of instructors who are underpaid.

Our budget for service — that is, help in the locker room, help in the office, our groundkeepers, cost of officials — has gone up tremendously since 1941 and 1942. It's just about doubled over what it was the last anywhere near normal year. That is, the nonacademic employees have been more successful in getting increases at our institution than the academic employees.

Our budget for equipment and expenses went up very nicely two or three years following the war, and we have had to take some small cuts the last two seasons, but we have had plenty to operate on.

MR. MORRELL: Mr. Chairman, I think one of the reasons Bowdoin sent out the questionnaire and is seeking information is that some of our institutions grew almost double in size during the war and are now being cut back to somewhere near a prewar enrollment. That, of course, means less money for the institution, and it is probably going to mean less money for athletics. We wanted to know what the other people were doing.

I want to ask Mr. Turner if, at the time they did away with the student fee, there wasn't an increase in tuition to offset it.

MR. TURNER: There was.

MR. MORRELL: So, as a matter of fact, it was a bookkeeping change. And I'd like to see that done at our institution.

We get a total of \$12,000. We are between 900 and 1000 now in enrollment, and we get exactly \$12,000 from student fees. I know quite a number of the institutions we compete with get more than twice that much in student fees. To me that whole thing is broad as it is long because the colleges that have done away with student fees have in most cases upped the tuition a bit to take care of it. I think that a great many people in institutions such as mine are going to be faced with a little more difficulty in getting their appropriations from the governing boards in the next few years.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Your tuition, Mr. Turner, went up \$50, didn't it?

MR. TURNER: I am not sure. I think the tuition the year they put it in came to \$450. What it was before that, I don't know. It is now \$600.

MR. HOWARD M. OLSON (Colorado College): Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to Mr. Turner, or any other member of the panel, if he wishes to answer it.

In the first place, Mr. Turner, the way you spoke of the collection of gate receipts, it sounded as though you felt you were somewhat tainting the sport by collecting. Was that what you actually meant?

MR. TURNER: No. It had no relation to the sport. The point of the elimination of the gate receipts was that we felt the danger of subsidization and commercialization existed at any point when the expenditures for athletics had any relation with the income from athletics and, therefore, this eliminates every and any possibility of that happening.

MR. METCALF: I'd like to say, in that connection, that I have nothing at all against gate receipts. When we dropped football, we lost our major source of gate receipts, and the chief reason we are not charging for a great many of the other events is that it got to the point where we were spending as much collecting the money as we got.

MR. OLSON: I would like to mention, in that regard, that you may have drama organizations, opera or musical organizations, and possibly collect money for those. I know that we do. We are out in a rather sparsely populated part of the country, and the purpose of gate receipts in our part of the country is largely to cover the transportation costs.

I would like to find out just about what your transportation is in just miles. I would like to give you ours. I think it is a rather different one from what you have. For example, in 1948 — this is considering just football — we had seven visiting football teams, each of which traveled 1400 miles, round trip. Colorado College went on three trips away from home, each trip consisting of a total of 325 miles.

That was for 1948. In 1949, we got it down to a little lower figure. Visiting teams for five home games traveled an average of 525 miles round trip, and since our games were somewhat on a home-and-home basis, our team had to travel away from home four times for a total for each game of 980 miles.

There is a problem that is quite different from the one you are up against, and in our case we feel if we can collect gate receipts and make the gate receipts cover the guarantees we are very lucky.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Are there any other remarks?

MR. H. G. DANFORD (Florida State University): I would like to know if any of the institutions represented on the panel are state-supported institutions and, if so, how do they persuade the politicians that intercollegiate athletics deserve to be supported out of state funds? That's a pretty important question to us.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: You heard the question. None of the men on the panel are from state universities.

MR. DANFORD: Are there any state universities so financing their intercollegiate athletics?

MR. GLENVILLE (University of New Hampshire): The University of New Hampshire, I am very glad to tell you, supports its athletic program in that fashion, and we do not have an athletic fee. We did have an athletic fee some years ago, but all fees were then included in the tuition and the tuition was raised, as it has been in every institution.

We, like any other department in the University, recommend to the president and the board of trustees the amount of money we need to operate our complete program of athletics and physical education. We do turn back to the University treasurer any unexpended funds. By the way, the treasurer's office of the University handles the operation

of selling and collecting all tickets and taking the money.

Our amount of income is only equivalent to one-third of the total cost of operating our program, not including salaries. The members of our staff are regular members of the University faculty, and are paid as members of the faculty. The politicians of the state, perhaps because they are not aware of it, have not said anything about it, and have not objected to it.

Does that answer your question?

MR. DANFORD: Ours are rather conscious of it down in Florida. How did you anesthetize them?

MR. GLENVILLE: As it happened, at one time we were operating under a student tax up to 1927. Our income was entirely from a student tax and from our gate admissions. Then we had a president who came to us and strongly believed that our department should be like any other department in the University, and made this recommendation to the board of trustees. It went through, and there was no need to take it to the state legislature. Perhaps we are fortunate because of that.

MR. DANFORD: I didn't mean to take it to the state legislature, but those boys have a way of finding out things.

MR. GLENVILLE: I might tell you that at the time of a recent meeting of the state legislature when the University of New Hampshire asked for an increased appropriation from the state, someone asked a question if our football program did not pay for the operation of the whole program, and the treasurer stood up and told them no, and then explained the way we did operate financially — and there was generous applause. So we probably have broad-minded, sympathetic legislators in our state.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: A great many of you have received this questionnaire by Bowdoin, which is conducting a survey on budgets. I might say that at Oberlin our total program is conducted right now on \$24,000; our total gate receipts were \$3518 from just football and basketball; guarantees from games away from home were \$565; and assessments on the student body — that is the activity fee which many of you had — were approximately \$15,000, which is about twice the amount that it was ten years ago.

As many of you know, a number of schools sent in a report on the amount of money they were collecting on student activity fees, and if any of you would like to know what it is, I'd like to tell you.

The three sources of income for most colleges are gate receipts — a small amount in this group — student activity fees plus an appropriation by the college and gate receipts.

MR. DANFORD: It is financed primarily by student fees. We are, perhaps, not a small college from the standpoint of enrollment, but we are small from the standpoint of gate receipts.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: We passed out the questionnaire so we could get specific facts and talk on specific things that are of interest to you men who have to finance athletics in a situation where you have very little gate receipts. How many here have student fees? Raise your hands, please.

(Approximately three-quarters of the audience raised their hands.)

How many do not have student fees?

(Six hands were raised.)

Where there is no student fee, how many, when that was eliminated, raised their tuition?

(Six hands were raised.)

Is there anyone else who would like to give a report on their receipts?

MR. ROBINSON (Mississippi College): Are the results of this study to be available to us?

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: We didn't ask these men to send it in; we just asked them to fill it out and bring it here for information to give to the body, because we thought maybe some of them wouldn't care to send it in.

I am informed that it will be made available to anybody who sends to Bowdoin. I only received three, as I told them all we wanted them to do was bring this here and be ready to report.

MR. ROBINSON: Why wouldn't it be desirable for us to have the results of a study being made at Bowdoin available?

MR. MORRELL: We'd be glad to do it.

MR. GEORGE GAUTHER (Ohio Wesleyan University): I have been very much interested in the fact that most of us have been following the same plan of operation in three or four things. First of all, with the increase in the tuition of the college, most of the athletic fees have been going out and have been combined with the general tuition and fees that are laid down.

I was glad that the suggestion was made that we send in these questionnaires and in return we get a compilation that will help us in this study. The fact is that the salaries of most of the men in our department, as has happened in our own institution, now are being paid under the educational budget of the institution.

I am glad to see that the receipts in our small colleges from the gate are considered no longer as an important matter and that they are turned into the bursar, or the treasurer, of the institution and are simply a part of the receipts of the university or college, and that we are operating on a program where we get a budget from the administration of the college. It is our job as administrators to see that we operate the best possible program on the budget that has been given to us for our operation.

It seems to me that we are all working on a very similar program, and if some of us are not, I'd be very much interested in hearing about any different programs that may be operating under at the present time.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: To put that question directly, how many here do not have to operate on a college budget — that is, do not go to the college for the major portion of their funds for the operation of their intercollegiate programs? I suppose I am putting it in reverse. Are there any colleges here that can operate a program out of intercollegiate gate receipts?

(One hand was raised.)

What school are you from, sir?

MR. WELSH (Kansas State Teachers College): Kansas State Teachers College. I'd like to trade jobs with a lot of you fellows.

I have been there for some twenty years, and the salaries of our department staff are paid by general funds in the institution. All expenses toward the operation of our intercollegiate program we must earn in some way. If I am lucky — and I have been lucky the last two or three years — we have been able to get ample funds.

I'd be very much interested in knowing, as the gentleman from Florida says, how I could anesthetize these state legislators to make an appropriation. I am very much concerned about the future, when we are going to have to rely on lower gate receipts due to, possibly, economic conditions.

We have three sources of income. We have an athletic fee of \$10 per student per year; we get the balance from gate receipts at home and from guarantees away from home.

In this period of twenty years I have found it necessary, unfortunately, to schedule above our class to make money. It is a very difficult situation. My guesses have to be right, and the only reason I stayed there that long, I guess, is that my guesses have been generally all right.

In 1946, we had three home football games where we had rain, with resulting low crowds. We finished up the year with a deficit of some \$7000. The last two years we haven't been catching that rain. We caught a hailstorm away from home, which didn't affect our income, this last year.

If there is any information that I might get from this group whereby we could ably stabilize our program as far as our concern about gate receipts is concerned, I would certainly be appreciative.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I'd like to ask at how many institutions the athletic staff is paid entirely from the institutional funds, the same as any other department.

(Practically the entire group raised their hands.)

Are there any here who have to pay them out of the gate receipts?
(No hands were raised.)

How many of the institutions have all the maintenance and upkeep being paid out of college funds?

(Practically the entire group raised their hands.)

Are there any here who have to maintain their fields out of gate receipts?

(Kansas State Teachers College.)

Approximately 75 per cent of the cost of your intercollegiate program is salaries and maintenance of equipment and athletic fields. If you can get that on the college budget, it will help you tremendously. The rest of it is minor.

MR. DYCHE: One of the gentlemen who spoke previously said that it seemed we are all doing about the same thing. I believe that is a pretty hasty conclusion, because there are only a very small number represented here.

Now, what is a small school and what is a large one hasn't been determined, but the average small school that I know of has to rely on gate receipts in order to maintain an intercollegiate schedule. My school is not typical because we have a tremendous traveling expense. Our nearest opponent is 225 miles away, and that's the only one; the rest are about 800 or 900 miles away. There are a good many institutions out in the West in that same predicament. We have to rely on gate receipts for the operation of the schedule, the travel, the expense of bringing teams in, the cost of the equipment, and that type of thing.

The main point I want to make is we shouldn't draw any conclusion about this until you know more about more small schools, and there are a lot of them.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: There are eighty small schools in the N.C.A.A. that could be classed, probably, as small schools from the standpoint of size. There are over sixty small schools in the N.C.A.A. that are not relying on gate receipts, except to carry the part of the program that I mentioned — travel and equipment. I mean there are about sixty that are carrying their instructional staff and their maintenance entirely on the college budget.

MR. BILHEIMER (Gettysburg College): I think you are wrong in that statement. I think it's about 50 per cent of the colleges.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Then you think it would be more?

MR. BILHEIMER: Yes. Of those in the N.C.A.A.

MR. DYCHE: There must be a lot of small colleges not in the N.C.A.A. then. There must be hundreds of them.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: There are.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, on that point. We are members of a small conference in the South. We have nine members. We had a session such as this at our recent annual meeting, and at that time five of the schools were in the same boat that we are all in here; four of our schools were trying to carry on an athletic program on gate receipts with a very insufficient appropriation from the administration and with a student fee as low as \$3 a year.

Obviously, you cannot operate a first-class college athletic program under conditions of that kind. It costs money to make the mare go.

As this gentleman has indicated, there are a good many colleges in the country — small colleges, particularly — who don't have the money to send people to a meeting of this kind, and I believe we have an obligation to those people. If we could make available to them some kind of a study which will show them that you can't operate a college athletic program without some help from the administration financially, then they could take that to their college administration and say, "See, I told you so." It would help a lot.

MR. BILHEIMER: If you would read the proceedings of the 37th N.C.A.A. meeting in New Orleans, it will give you an immense amount of material on just that topic.

MR. LIVINGSTON: We have been hearing a great deal about finances. Of course, some of the small colleges are taking in a few dollars, not many. What is going to happen when television comes into the picture and takes away the few dollars we are taking in at the present time? Are we going to make a study of that here in the small group, or are we going to let the large group decide for us?

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I don't think that anything we do about television will make any difference. I mean I don't think we can do anything about it. The large colleges think maybe they can do something about it, and maybe they can, but I doubt if they could prevent television any more than they could prevent radio. And you all know that the more television comes in, the less we are going to have at our small college games.

MR. VIRGIL YELKIN (University of Omaha): What we did at our institution was to divide our program into three groups and get a budget for each group. We have an intramural fund from the budget made up of student activity fees; our athletic program is financed from an athletic budget, and the physical education program is taken care of by a physical education budget. So in one department we have three budgets. We have gained in our overall picture by chopping up one budget into three parts. That is one of the ways we did get some money.

We are an institution that is run by state-supported funds, and any income from gate receipts — which is very little, about one-fifth of our budget — goes into a reserve for the next year, to be used in the next year's budget when we submit it. That's one of the tricks we used.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Is there anyone here who would disagree that as television comes more and more into the picture our gate receipts will become less and less?

MR. TURNER: I'd like to make a comment on that. Baltimore is supposed to have the highest ratio of television sets per population figures, and I don't think that we noticed an appreciable drop in our crowd this year over last year. We have no definite count, of course, but the crowds this year seem to be just as big as they were last year.

MR. GAUTHIER: I'd like to state that if you were in the territory covered by Ohio State University and the University of Michigan, it

would make a great difference on that day in all the small colleges in that territory.

We had the experience of 400 or 500 of our student body being over in the building looking at the television set with a game going on 100 yards away on their own field. That's something that concerns us all for the future.

MR. MORRELL: Let us out of here before we get scared to death.

MR. GEIGER: I know in Boston, and I don't know how many games were piped in Saturday afternoon, Tufts, Northeastern and other local colleges had larger gate receipts this past year than they have had for some time.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I want to thank the panel for their help. I think this has been very interesting. I hope you all got something out of it.

THE BUSINESS SESSION

Saturday, January 14, 1950

The annual business session of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened Saturday morning, January 14, 1950, at 9:30 a.m., President Karl E. Leib presiding.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

K. L. WILSON: The post-war growth of the Association has been nothing short of phenomenal. The N.C.A.A. truly has become the national parent body for college athletics in this country. It seems to me that your Association now performs three important functions which might be specifically commented on at this time. First, through its various rules committees, it establishes the rules and regulations under which our collegiate sports are played. Second, it governs the conduct of the national collegiate championships and annually stages 12 meets and tournaments for the competition of our member teams and athletes. Third, — and this is a relatively new function for the Association — it draws the rules of conduct under which our member institutions carry on their athletic programs. This third function of the Association is an important one. Presently there are different opinions among the members as to exactly what rules should govern the conduct of collegiate programs among N.C.A.A. institutions. I feel confident that these differences eventually will be satisfied, and we all will agree upon a satisfactory Code. Through correspondence I know personally that the vast majority of our members are keenly interested in seeing this come about. One example of this is the fact that our membership rolls increase annually. Non-member institutions have a new desire to become affiliated with the Association because they believe in the aims of the Association.

Since our last convention, 14 new institutions have become active N.C.A.A. members. They are:

- 2nd District — Hartwick College, Oneonta, New York
State Teachers College, Cortland, New York
- 3rd District — Florida State University, Tallahassee
Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia
- 4th District — Wilberforce State College, Wilberforce, Ohio
- 5th District — Nebraska State Teachers, Wayne
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks
Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa

6th District — Midwestern University, Wichita Falls, Texas
North Texas State, College, Denton
Philander Smith College, Little Rock, Ark.
Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas
University of Houston, Houston, Texas

8th District — Idaho State College, Pocatello
In addition one conference has become an allied member, the Gulf Coast Intercollegiate.

As I have mentioned previously the expansion of the N.C.A.A. in the past five years has been amazing. At the request of the members the N.C.A.A. has entered into many new activities. For example, your Executive Committee has authorized a change in the publication program of the Official Guides of this Association. Due to a variety of reasons, our contract with the publishing firm of A. S. Barnes and Company, New York, was terminated and arrangements made for the National Collegiate Athletic Bureau, service branch of the N.C.A.A., to publish the Guides. To my mind, this constitutes a very fine move by the Association. I am sure you all will find that the Guides will be issued on time and that you will be able to obtain the quantity of Guides you want at the time you want them.

At the present time it could be said that the Association has reached a saturation point. The receipts and disbursements just about balance. The Association is able to pay the cost of its present activities on the basis of current receipts. However, the Executive Committee of your Association realizes that the N.C.A.A. needs additional revenue. For the past two years your officers have urged that a separate N.C.A.A. office be established so that the varying functions of the Association can be handled more efficiently. The Executive Committee has studied ways and means of financing a separate office, and it is quite likely that at the next convention of the N.C.A.A. it will be recommended that the dues be increased. Many member institutions have indicated that the N.C.A.A. is an important enough association that members would be willing to pay higher dues for the services rendered.

In this connection I would like to refer to the report of the Treasurer as printed on page 47 of the Convention Bulletin which has been distributed to you. I would like to point out that the financial report ending August 31, 1949, covers a full year or 12-month period. However, comparison with the financial report for the year ending August 31, 1948, is difficult. The figures provided in the latter report cover only a 9-month period due to a change in the fiscal year of this Association. During the past fiscal year ending August 31, 1949, the Association ran a deficit. This was primarily due

to unusual expenditures in the fields of football rules, television and convention expense.

Due to the recodification of the football rules, several special meetings of that rules committee were necessary. The normal annual expenses of that committee were increased by approximately \$4000. Due to the problem of television and the fact that several of our institutions felt that the N.C.A.A. should conduct a survey, \$5000 was appropriated for this purpose. The convention expenses of the Association marked an increase of approximately \$1500 because of the extra charges leveled by the hotels in San Francisco at the time of our 43rd annual meeting. During the first three years of the N.C.A.A. Baseball Tournament the Association has annually subsidized that particular championship in varying degrees. It is encouraging to note that each year the amount requested from the N.C.A.A. has been less. The Baseball Committee of the N.C.A.A. is highly enthusiastic about the possibilities of the 1950 Tournament and it is expected that the Tournament will pay its own way this year.

I have been connected with the affairs of this Association in one capacity or another for almost a quarter of a century. I have watched it develop from the time that the Secretary put all of his letters in longhand to the present time where we have competent secretarial help, modern office machinery, etc. During the so-called "good old days" our meetings were primarily discussion sessions and the convention was more of a social affair where old friends met than a business session. Now we are a very earnest and live Association. Several people have commented to me that they are concerned about the future because of the sharply divided opinions on the issues before us. Naturally, that concerns me, too, but in all honesty I feel the N.C.A.A. is a much healthier organization as a result of this. I hope it means something to our member schools, and I am confident that if we work hard, express our opinions frankly and give honest thought to the problems confronting us, we will find a solution to this same problem.

GENERAL BUSINESS

1. *Approval of the Minutes.* Upon motion duly made and seconded, it was voted to approve the minutes of the Forty-Third Convention as distributed in the Yearbook.

2. *A Credentials Committee*, consisting of Sam Shirky, University of Missouri, and Robert A. Fetzer, University of North Carolina, was approved as appointed.

3. *Reports of the District Presidents and Committee Chairmen.* Upon motion duly made and seconded, it was voted to accept the reports as distributed in the Convention Bulletin. The reports are published elsewhere in this Yearbook.

4. *Report of the Treasurer.* The audited report of the Treasurer was distributed in the Convention Bulletin and upon motion duly made and seconded it was accepted as presented and is printed in the Appendix of this Yearbook.

5. *Report of the Secretary.* Upon motion duly made and seconded, it was voted to accept the Secretary's report as presented by Mr. Wilson.

6. *Membership Transfers.* Upon motion duly made and seconded, it was voted to approve the Executive Committee's recommendation that Idaho State College's membership be transferred from the Eighth to the Seventh District, and Georgetown University's membership be transferred from the Third to the Second District, as requested by those institutions.

7. *Sites and Dates of 1950 Meets and Tournaments.* The sites and dates of the Association's 1950 meets and tournaments, as approved by the Executive Committee, were reported and approved by the convention.

8. *1950 Convention.* Upon motion duly made and seconded, it was voted to approve the recommendation that the 1951 convention of the Association be held in Dallas, Texas, the second week of January.

9. *Television Recommendation.*

PRESIDENT LEIB: Ralph Furey will report on Television.

MR. RALPH FUREY (Columbia University): Gentlemen, this is the recommendation which was adopted at the Television meeting of the N.C.A.A. yesterday. I will read it, and if there are any questions, I will be glad to elaborate.

"We recommend the immediate appointment of an active and representative television committee of the National Collegiate Athletic Association with instructions that that committee make a thorough investigation of all material now available and report to the Executive Committee of the National Collegiate Athletic Association at the regular June meeting. Furthermore, if the study of the television committee indicates that action of any type should be necessary, that steps be instituted to provide for amendments to the Constitution of the National Collegiate Athletic Association in order that television be properly controlled.

"Pending any possible action at the 1951 convention, we urge that the National Collegiate Athletic Association recommend to its members that no television commitments be made beyond the 1950-51 college year."

That is a motion.

PRESIDENT LEIB: You have heard the motion. Is there a second?

(The motion was seconded, put to a vote and carried.)

10. *Report of Baseball Committee.*

MR. FRANK McCORMICK (University of Minnesota): Mr. President and Gentlemen: The Baseball Committee wishes to submit the following report:

For two years the N.C.A.A. tournament consisted of an Eastern and Western play-off and a two-team final. Last year regional play-offs were held with a four-team final. The finals were held at Wichita, the University of Wichita being the host institution. Jim Trimble, Athletic Director of the University of Wichita, was in charge and did a fine job. We realized a \$9043 net to distribute back to the teams on a pro rata basis.

This year your Committee recommended to the Executive Committee that instead of a four-team tournament, there be an eight-team championship, which will be held a week earlier, the third week in

June. Under this arrangement, eight teams, one from each district, will come in and play a double elimination.

The Executive Committee has approved the recommendation.

Gentlemen, this tournament has and will help college baseball a great deal throughout the country. We feel that college baseball is playing a most important part in the athletic programs at the present time, and, for your information, the United States will send an amateur baseball team, composed of some college men, to the Pan-American Games a year from now — in 1951.

Mr. President, I feel that college baseball has made fine progress in the last three or four years, and I only hope it continues to grow and becomes one of the most important events in the athletic program that we have.

I move the acceptance of the report.

(The motion was seconded.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: Any discussion? I really think that along with our action on this motion should be an expression of appreciation of the excellent work that the Chairman of the Baseball Committee has done.

(The motion was put to a vote and carried.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: Now we are about ready to proceed to the consideration of some of the amendments which have been regularly submitted through the Secretary's office for consideration at this meeting. Before we undertake that, there are two announcements which I have to make for your information.

First of all, the Executive Committee has taken action to provide that if an institution's membership is terminated because of non-compliance, existing contracts entered into in good faith in regard to which there is adequate evidence, may be carried out between members of the Association and such institution. That is a question which has come to me from a number of members, and I present that for your information.

Another announcement which I should like to make at this time is as to the receipt of a telegram from The Citadel, which I shall read to you.

Dr. Karl E. Leib, President
National Collegiate Athletic Assn.
Commodore Hotel
New York City

Beg to advise you officially again that Citadel has terminated its membership in N.C.A.A. This fact was communicated to your Chicago office under date of December 5, 1949, acknowledged by Mr. Byers under date of December 15, 1949. Letter from our president under date of January 4, 1950, restated this fact. Was before your committee on January 12 and personally stated this fact.

This message is sent to you for one purpose, of clearing up the report to me that your committee did not consider these messages as a resignation.

This and other communications mean that we have resigned December 5, 1949, and not an effort to change any N.C.A.A. action concerning The Citadel.

Signed

D. S. McAlister

I take it that the attitude of The Citadel is quite apparent as a result of this telegram.

The next item is the report of the Bowl Games Committee. Mr. Victor O. Schmidt, Chairman.

11. *Report of Bowl Games Committee.*

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. President and Gentlemen: All members have received by mail from the office of the Secretary a notice of the constitutional amendments proposed by the Bowl Games Committee for adoption by this convention. The members will recall that the convention in San Francisco a year ago instructed the Bowl Games Committee to establish definite standards or criteria of management participation, control and distribution of proceeds of so-called bowl games, and take all necessary steps to insure that proper notices of its recommendations in respects mentioned should be circularized to the membership so that final action could be taken on this subject at and by this convention.

The Committee has performed this assignment. Its recommendations in that regard are:

It is proposed that the Constitution of the National Collegiate Athletic Association be amended by the addition of a new section to be numbered Section 6 of Article III in the following form.

Section 6. Principle Governing Competition in Post-season and Non-Collegiate Sponsored Contests.

Competition by member institutions in post-season contests and in contests, meets or tournaments which are sponsored, promoted, managed or controlled by any non-collegiate entity shall conform to the provisions of this Constitution and to the Rules or Regulations prescribed by this Association.

No member institution of the National Collegiate Athletic Association shall compete in any football game that is not scheduled as to the identity of a participating collegiate team before the beginning of the regular football season of the college for any academic year, unless the given contest complies with the following requirements:

(a) Any non-collegiate or non-Conference sponsoring committee of any such game shall include in the membership of its administrative committee at least two representatives from member institutions of this Association, one to be a faculty member and one to be an athletic official, to be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Association.

(b) No member institution shall participate in more than one such game during any academic year.

(c) Game officials shall be mutually agreed upon by the competing institutions.

(d) Competing institutions shall be allocated not less than one-third of the total seats in the stadium in such proportion as they may agree, or if they do not agree then with a minimum of one-sixth of the total seats in the stadium to be made available to each. An institution not requiring its full allocation of tickets shall make available its unused portion of the allotment to the other institution. All unsold tickets shall be returned to any sponsoring persons or organization not less than 15 days in advance of the date of the game.

(e) The competing institutions shall receive not less than eighty per cent (80%) of the gross receipts, out of which each may be required to defray its own traveling and other team expenses incidental to the game. Not more than twenty per cent (20%) of the gross receipts shall be paid to or retained by any sponsoring person or organization, and out of such portion of the gross receipts shall be paid all game expenses including stadium rental, printing of tickets, ticket sellers, ticket takers, ushers, game officials, promotion, publicity, and any other expense.

The gross receipts shall be all revenues derived from the game including sale of tickets (less taxes), concessions, programs, radio

rights, video rights, movie rights and any other income derived from the operation of the game. Any complimentary tickets shall be accounted for at face value and shall become a part of the gross receipts.

In instances in which any sponsoring person or organization may have made legal commitments prior to August 14, 1949, for capital improvements on the stadium in which the game is played it may in addition to the maximum of twenty per cent (20%) of gross receipts above permitted to be paid to or retained by it (and by a corresponding reduction of the above eighty per cent (80%) participation in gross receipts by the competing institutions) be allowed to receive or retain for the purpose of amortizing or of paying interest obligations on such commitments such amount as is necessary to meet its annual fixed obligations thereon, or where the same is not fixed then such amount as it may have paid thereon out of the receipts of any such previous game, but in no case exceeding for such purposes an amount of twenty per cent (20%) of the gross receipts of any game.

(f) Certification by an Extra Events Committee of this Association that the given contest meets the above qualifications and any other regulations of the Association.

A standing committee of this Association to be known as the Committee on Extra Events is hereby established. The functions of this Committee shall include:

(a) Receiving evidence insuring that any contests covered by this section which are presently established comply with the qualifications pertinent to them.

(b) Examining notices of intent for the inauguration of such contests, which are to be received from proposed sponsors only at an annual meeting of this Association and which the Committee will approve or disapprove at the succeeding national convention of the Association.

(c) Certifying that any given contest meets these qualifications and other regulations of the Association.

Any football game scheduled by one college with another college to be played on a common and regular open date of their regular football season on the campus or in the regular playing stadium of either shall be excepted from coming within this section even if scheduled after the season of either collegiate participant has commenced.

This section shall be effective as of January 8, 1949, provided that it shall not affect legal and enforceable commitments made by any member prior to January 8, 1949.

I move its acceptance and approval.

(The motion was seconded.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: Is there any discussion?

MR. HENRY ROTTSCHEFER (University of Minnesota): Will you state exactly what approval of the report means? I am perfectly willing to vote acceptance. But I want to find out exactly what "approval" would involve. It certainly would not involve the acceptance of the proposed amendments, would it?

PRESIDENT LEIB: That is the opinion of the Chair. I had considered the very point which you make, and take it that acceptance and approval at this time merely indicates acceptance of the report by this group.

MR. ROTTSCHEFER: There will be an independent motion that the Constitution be amended.

PRESIDENT LEIB: My interpretation is that this is not the offering of a constitutional amendment at this time. This is on our agenda to be brought up later.

MR. ROTTSCHEFER: I think you have answered the question, Mr. Chairman. The point is that a vote in favor of this is merely to accept the report.

PRESIDENT LEIB: Perhaps it might simplify the question if the maker of the motion, with the approval of the second, would consent to the motion's being simply for the acceptance of the report, which would make it quite definite as to what is involved. Does the maker of the motion accept that interpretation?

(The interpretation of the Chair was accepted by the maker and seconder of the motion.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: The motion before us, then, is the acceptance of the report of the Bowl Games Committee. Any further discussion? (The motion was put to a vote and carried.)

12. Consideration of Amendments.

PRESIDENT LEIB: We now have before us certain proposals for amendments to the Constitution, for consideration at this business session, the first being an amendment proposed by the Southwest Athletic Conference. Does the representative of the Southwest Athletic Conference desire to present this motion?

MR. JAMES H. STEWART: I would like to waive my position in favor of Bill Alexander.

MR. W. A. ALEXANDER (Georgia Tech): Last June the Southeastern Conference, Southwest Conference and the Southern Conference met in Atlanta to discuss the Sanity Code. At that time they agreed on an amendment. The amendment has to do with Paragraph H. The amendment is, "Nothing herein shall, however, be construed as a disapproval of indirect aids in the form of benefits reasonably incidental to actual participation in intercollegiate athletics, such as medical attention, meals on sanctioned trips" — and this is a new part — "and a training table established on the home campus."

Let me say before I go into any other details of such amendment that I was very happy to serve on the National Collegiate Committee that brought in the present Sanity Code, and my institution, together with most of the institutions in those three conferences, has tried to adopt that Code.

The gentlemen who drafted that Code are Professor Willett of Southern California; Professor Aigler of Michigan; Professor Houston of Tufts; Norton Pritchett of Virginia; President Davies of Colorado College, and myself. We did the best job we could. What we brought in didn't give enough consideration of the different types of institutions in this country. It didn't take into consideration the terrible expense that these boys are put to in order to get through college when they have just tuition and their fees paid for. It didn't take into consideration that many institutions do not have tuition for the state residents. In Georgia, we have no tuition for Georgia boys at Georgia Tech. We do have small fees, but that is not the great part of the expense. We certainly didn't take into consideration the effect on the military institutions. Of course, the Naval Academy and the Army are well taken care of as the Government subsidizes every cadet. A number of other military institutions do nearly what they do. Take V.M.I., a great institution that has been in existence for a hundred years, which has sent its sons to all the wars that we have had in this country, an institution that graduated General Marshall. We have commitments to play V.M.I. in '50 and '51. I will be glad to continue those two years, but we intend to go further. We didn't take into consideration the institutions that are dominated by some religious belief and their problems.

Many years ago when I first commenced to coach, I talked to Dan

McEwen, of Vanderbilt University. Dan said, "Whenever a boy can legally go into an institution and can do passing work in his studies, he needs all the aid that should be given in order for him to graduate." I think that that principle still stands.

In talking to Knute Rockne, he said, "Give the boy the kind of job he needs. If he is a rich boy and from a wealthy family, give him no job. If he doesn't need much, give him a job that will just get him by. If he needs lots of help, give him a big job." He said, "Here at Notre Dame we have one great job that we generally split up among six or eight of the seniors that have done well and that need help, and that is the parking privileges at the football game."

I think our committee did an excellent job when they settled on the tuition and fees, and they said, "You can have a job that will pay the rest of your expenses." Now, that is the thing that I want to talk about. I have prepared a written report on this part of it as I want it to be published as these three conferences have recommended it.

In adopting the present Constitution, the N.C.A.A. was forced to accept the principle of an athletic scholarship. They declared that schools could give scholarships with tuition and fees provided the student proved his need. The question of an athlete's other expenses in college — room, board, books, military uniforms and laundry — were left up to —

1. Other scholarships based on scholastic achievement.
2. Help from home.
3. Work.

In addition, Paragraph H of Section 3 declared the legality of such items as medical attention, meals on sanctioned trips, and one meal a day during the season of the sport in question. It seems to many of us, who are engaged in the problem of looking out for boys whose need requires them to work for their expenses beyond tuition and fees, that we have been given a practically impossible problem.

The values at Georgia Tech are indicative of the values of the rest of the country: Room, \$108; laundry, \$72 a year; books and military uniforms, \$70; food, \$450 per year. This totals \$700 and \$700 divided by nine equals \$77.78 per month. What boy can honestly play football, keep up his studies and earn \$77.78 per month? A boy can earn \$77.78 per month if he has a gift job in town, if he is on the payroll of some state department, like the highway department, if he is a friend of some wealthy alumnus, or if he does jobs around the fraternity house that is willing to offer pay for a star athlete.

The Southwest Conference, the Southeastern Conference and the Southern Conference at a joint meeting discussed these problems. To obey the rules of the N.C.A.A., both as to scholarship requirements and as to no aid from alumni to the individual boy, it was deemed advisable to offer the following amendment — the one I just read. This amendment will allow a needy boy to receive his tuition and fee scholarship from an institution and his meals on the training table. Therefore, it would mean that the boy would need a job paying from \$28 to \$35 a month to pay for the other extras such as room, books, military uniform and laundry.

We would like to point out that there is a vast difference between the scholarship, tuition and fees and three meals on a training table.

The boy who is given his tuition and fees scholarship by the faculty is entitled to that scholarship as long as he behaves himself and passes his work until he graduates from college. The question of whether a boy eats on a training table is entirely a coaching problem. If a boy is on a training table and through poor service and misattention to athletics fails to earn his place on that table, then the coaching staff or athletic director will drop him from that table. However, such a

boy would still retain his tuition and fee scholarship from the faculty, and by quitting his athletics could spend all of his spare time in such work as the college employment agency might offer him. It would be entirely possible for him to thus earn his way through college. We have such cases on record at Georgia Tech.

It might be well to point out that at the present time the regulations allow one of three meals a day during the season and we propose a change from one meal to three meals and not a change in any other of the regulations. It is simply a change in the number of meals allowed. For most universities in our section, such a change is a necessity.

Present rules and regulations would fit the expenses of the early 1900's. In 1906-7, my tuition and fees at Georgia Tech were \$55 per year; books, \$12 per year; board, room and laundry, \$121.50 per year. In those days, \$20 per month for nine months would take care of all of this, except \$8.50. I know this is correct, because I worked my way through college. We had a training table in those days for which we paid the sum of \$2.25 per week. We did not need anything but a \$20 or \$25 a month job for all of our expenses. I remember in the old days when a number of colleges in the East had training tables and training houses in which athletes lived and in which they had their food. I imagine their expenses were nothing, or did not amount to a great deal.

In conversation with General Shutes of Michigan this spring, he discussed the fine food that he received at Michigan on the training table. He said it was some job to get up to three dollars per week necessary to pay for this food. In some way he was able to provide it. In those days, a boy could get a job for the summer, save his money, and have sufficient to pay his way through college for the rest of the year. Nowadays, that is impossible and will be impossible.

The Southwest Conference, the Southeastern Conference and the Southern Conference can operate under N.C.A.A. regulations if this amendment passes. If it does not, then we will have to go to the gift job in town, the wealthy alumnus, state highway jobs and to jobs at the fraternities.

PRESIDENT LEIB: Now, just to assure ourselves that we are proceeding in regular order, the motion as made, I believe, is as follows:

"Amend Paragraph H, Section 4 of Article III to read:

"H. Nothing herein shall, however, be construed as a disapproval of indirect aids in the form of benefits reasonably incidental to actual participation in intercollegiate athletics, such as medical attention, meals on sanctioned trips, and a training table established on the home campus."

Proposed Amendment:

No. 2, then, is before us. Is there a motion for the adoption of the amendment proposed under No. 2, on page 59 of the Convention Bulletin?

MR. ALEXANDER: I so move.
(The motion was seconded.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: Regularly moved and seconded. Is there discussion?

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. President, can we have a written vote?

PRESIDENT LEIB: You can. It is certainly the privilege of the convention to call for a written vote. Now, let me say to you that it has been my intention on these amendments to call for a voice vote, roll call with the idea of saving time. The manner in which the ballots will be conducted is subject to the will of the convention. However, before we proceed with that — well, we will have to proceed to that

before we can go further. What is the will of the convention in regard to the manner in which this vote shall be taken? Is there a motion that there be a written ballot by roll call?

MEMBER: I so move.

(The motion was seconded.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: There is a motion and second that there be a written ballot by roll call. Is there any discussion? If there is no discussion, are you ready for the question?

The motion is that there be a written vote, checked against the list of accredited delegates. All those in favor say "aye,"; opposed. The Chair is in doubt. Will those in favor please rise? Will those opposed please rise? The motion is carried.

A word in regard to the mechanics. The ballot box is located at the table. The proposal which we have under consideration is No. 2 in the Convention Bulletin. In casting your vote, if you wish to vote in favor of the amendment, you will mark "Yes" on your ballot. If you wish to oppose it, you will mark "No" on your ballot. As the roll is called, the representative from each institution will pass over to the table, identify himself to the accreditation committee, and, on their approval, will cast his ballot. I suggest that where there are several delegates, they caucus, and that the vote of the institution be cast by one delegate, which will save us a great deal of time and inconvenience in carrying through the ballot.

DR. NICHOLS: Where you are voting also for a conference, do you vote on the same card?

PRESIDENT LEIB: In that case, I think it will simplify the procedure if you will identify yourself as the representative of an institution, cast your ballot; identify yourself as the representative of the conference, and cast another ballot, in which case we will have a card for each vote. That will simplify the task of the tellers.

MEMBER: How do you know that everyone here is entitled to vote?

PRESIDENT LEIB: Through his identification with the accreditation committee at the table. They have a list of the representatives of institutions. Each representative on passing to the table after the name of his institution has been called, will identify himself with the accreditation committee before casting his ballot.

EMIL L. LARSON (Border Conference): Does "training table" mean meals?

PRESIDENT LEIB: We are to have discussion on the motion, at which time you may ask that question.

MR. LARSON: Before or after the vote?

PRESIDENT LEIB: Before the vote.

RALPH W. AIGLER (University of Michigan): Conference members are entitled to one vote?

PRESIDENT LEIB: One vote by conferences.

The floor is now open for discussion.

JAMES LYNAH (Cornell University): I am certainly reluctant to get up here and speak in opposition to anything my good and respected friend Bill Alexander advocates. I feel, however, that the Sanity Code as it now exists is very liberal. It has been given a partial trial. The provisions of the Code, the principles of the Code, as certified by nearly all of the colleges that have returned questionnaires to the Compliance Committee, indicate that the principles of the Code as they now exist are acceptable.

I know that many colleges have had to adjust their training table

pay arrangements, and so forth, to meet the principles of the Code. Apparently the majority is satisfied.

It seems to me that where our good institutions in the South — and I come from that part of the country, and so I know a little bit about conditions down there — find it desirable to come up in Pennsylvania and Ohio and other eastern states to find needy boys to play on their football teams, these institutions then require this kind of assistance. But we are going just a little bit too far. We have got plenty of good football talent in the South; we don't have to do that.

I feel any step that we take here today to further liberalize the principles of the Sanity Code as it now exists is a backward step.

PRESIDENT LEIB: Is there any further discussion?

MR. AIGLER (University of Michigan): I have no disposition to engage in any argument or discussion of the motion. My purpose is to ask a question, and it is a very simple question. I think I know the answer to it, but I am not sure that everybody in the room knows the answer to it. You will notice that the language of the proposed amendment as moved by Mr. Alexander provides, in effect, for changing the provision in the existing Constitution, allowing one meal during the season to "a training table."

Now, to me, the phrase "training table" has a very clear and well-defined meaning, and I suspect it does to many people in this room, and that is that a training table is a place at which athletes eat during the season of the sport, in which those athletes are taking part, that is, provided they demonstrated sufficient proficiency to be included on the training table.

Now, I have a notion that the phrase "training table" as used in this resolution is not intended to mean that. If I am wrong about it, I think it ought to be clarified here unmistakably. My understanding is that the phrase "training table" as used in this motion is to mean board for athletes throughout the entire college year, not simply during the season of the sport in which the young man happens to be engaged. I have the more confidence in expressing that opinion because if I am wrong on that, then this amendment would be almost identical with amendment No. 1, which does call specifically for three meals a day during the season.

So please understand, Mr. Chairman, that is in the form of a question which I think by all means must be clarified before there is any vote taken.

PRESIDENT LEIB: I will ask Mr. Alexander whether he can clarify the intent of the phraseology in the motion.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. President, when we made this motion, we knew that Mr. Stewart, of the Southwest Conference, would put in a motion in which he would define a training table as Professor Aigler here has suggested it. I think that is a little strict and would lead to a little double dealing. If this passes, then the practice will be to take all the football players and make them go out for winter sports, and when they get through that, if need be, he will make them go out for spring sports.

I simply left the phrase "training table" so each institution could operate it as they see fit. It would mean three meals a day, if you wanted it to mean three meals a day. It would mean three meals a day during the season of the sport, and then drop most of the men, keeping five or six needy boys that couldn't get a job earning enough to pay for their meals. I think we have got to give the institution some authority and some control in the operation of any Sanity Code that we pass.

DR. J. H. NICHOLS (Oberlin College): As Bill Alexander has said, there are many different types of institutions represented in the

N.C.A.A. I represent, as chairman of the Small College Group, what I believe to be about a hundred institutions in the N.C.A.A. who are small college institutions. Anything such as has been proposed in the amendment would be, of course, not only impossible, but would be ruinous to any small college that is conducting its athletics simply out of educational funds. Of course, Bill could say, "Well you don't have to do that," but I would like to point out that you don't have to have a training table if you don't want to. But I would also like to point out further that it does put a still further squeeze on the small college, and a very definite squeeze in that way. The cost would simply be impossible in any small college, and we represent a large group in the N.C.A.A.

I appreciate perfectly well that the problems in these different colleges are entirely different, and that is one of the difficult things in an organization of this sort.

NORTON PRITCHETT (University of Virginia): Gentlemen, without undertaking to speak on behalf of this amendment, so many people have asked what the position of the University of Virginia might be, in view of the proposals contained in this amendment, that we have thought it was only appropriate that we should tell you the best we can conclude about the matter here in New York with the people who are here with us.

I want to say that the University of Virginia undertook to offer an amendment to this convention which sets forth what we believe to be the forthright and the workable arrangement in intercollegiate athletics, namely, an amendment to the Sanity Code which would permit the payment to needy athletes who meet requirements of the institution academically and from the point of view of character, their tuition, their room, their board, and their incidental fees.

I want further to say that apparently through some neglect on the part of an employee of the University of Virginia that amendment was not mailed to the secretary of this Association in time to be brought to your attention, although I am informed from some representatives here that they received copies of it.

In regard to the proposal made by Mr. Alexander, we have considered the matter carefully among ourselves here. We will have to receive approval of authorities representing our boys at the University before we can make any alteration officially of the position which we have taken. However, we believe that if this amendment is passed and if it is interpreted to mean that the institution can provide an athlete with meals for nine months of the college year, it is probable that we can find legitimate, honest employment at the going rate of compensation to supplement the necessary expenses of our boys, and I tell you that simply in order that you may know what is in our minds and the situation in which we find ourselves.

PRESIDENT LEIB: Is there any further discussion?

Are you ready for the question? The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY WILSON: In order to expedite this, I will not call the name of the delegates. You can identify yourself for the Credentials Committee.

(Secretary Wilson called the roll.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: I shall ask Jim Stewart, Vic Schmidt and Asa Bushnell to act as tellers.

It has been suggested that we have one or two matters here which we might be able to dispose of somewhat more rapidly. While the tellers are counting the votes on Amendment No. 2 and we are getting the results, it might be possible to pass on to No. 3, for the moment setting aside consideration of No. 1, which has merely waived position and is to come up for consideration.

In regard to recommendation No. 3, having to do with the principle governing recruiting, it might be possible for us, in the interest of saving time, to have a voice roll call vote, rather than depositing ballots. Is there a motion to that effect?

(A motion was made and seconded that No. 3 be considered.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: You have heard the motion, made and seconded, that we proceed to consideration of No. 3, and that the vote be taken by roll call voice vote. Does the representative of Dartmouth College desire to present this amendment?

WILLIAM H. McCARTER (Dartmouth College): We propose the following:

Amend Article III, Section 5, by lettering present paragraph of this section as (a) and by adding two other paragraphs, (b) and (c), thus making Section 5 read as follows:

"Section 5. Principle Governing Recruiting.

- (a) No member of an athletic staff or other official representative of athletic interests shall solicit the attendance at his institution of any prospective student with the offer of financial aid or equivalent inducements. This, however, shall not be deemed to prohibit such staff member or other representative from giving information regarding aids permissible under Section 4.
- (b) No member institution shall, directly or through its athletic staff members or by any other means, pay the traveling expenses of any prospective student visiting its campus, nor shall it arrange for or permit excessive entertainment of such prospective student during his visit there.
- (c) No member institution shall, on its campus or elsewhere, conduct or have conducted in its behalf any athletic practice session or test at which one or more prospective students reveal, demonstrate, or display their abilities in any branch of sport."

The first paragraph read already exists in the Constitution. The second paragraph simply says that the athletic organization or the institution shall not pay traveling expenses for prospective students coming to look over the scene, and the third paragraph says simply there shall be no tryouts. In my opinion, gentlemen, this is entirely in the spirit of the Sanity Code. It is a loophole that was neglected when the Code was first drawn up.

The Compliance Committee has already pointed out in a bulletin that no matter what its opinion is, these particular practices are not specifically covered. They represent the actual procedure at a great many member institutions and member conferences of the National Association, and I should recommend very strongly their adoption as being entirely in line with the Sanity Code that now exists.

I would suggest, subject to the approval of the Chair and the members, that the two paragraphs "b" and "c" be acted upon separately, because they are different problems and we might conceivably have different ideas on them.

PRESIDENT LEIB: You have heard the report of the proposer of the amendment. Is it the will of the convention that the proposals "b" and "c" be acted upon separately, or that the entire proposal be acted upon as a unit? Is there a motion?

(A motion was made and seconded that they be acted upon separately.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: There is a motion made and seconded that sections of the third proposal for a constitutional amendment be voted upon separately. Is there any discussion? All those in favor? Op-

posed? The Chair is in doubt. Those in favor please stand. Those opposed. I am afraid we are going to have to have a count. The motion is that each subdivision of proposal No. 3 presented by Dartmouth College be voted upon separately. Will all those in favor please stand again? Those opposed? The motion is defeated. The motion being defeated, the proposal will be taken up as a unit. The proposal before us in No. 3 as presented by Dartmouth College. Is there a motion that it be adopted?

(A motion was made and seconded that Amendment No. 3 be adopted.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: It is moved and seconded that the proposal by Dartmouth College for amendment to the Constitution be adopted. Is there any discussion? The question is called for. Is it satisfactory to the group that this be a roll call voice vote rather than a written ballot? Is there any objection? In that case, the Secretary will please call the roll and enter the results.

SECRETARY WILSON: Are the tally experts ready?

PRESIDENT LEIB: The question has been raised as to how the delegates can be identified as they vote. Is there any objection to the representative of the institution rising, identifying himself and casting his vote?

(Secretary Wilson called the roll.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: While the tellers are enumerating the vote, I am ready to announce the result of the vote on Amendment No. 2 which was voted on by written ballot.

Yes: 106.

No: 115.

Not Voting: 1.

The necessary two-thirds not having been achieved, the motion is lost.

The suggestion has been made that we waive the previously considered order of business and pass immediately to the recommendation of the Compliance Committee. That is a matter which is within the power of this body to determine. I understand that some of our men are worried about their train reservations.

I would like to have a motion on this subject, preferably from one of the representatives of the group directly interested. Is there a motion?

H. C. BYRD (University of Maryland): I move that the matter be taken up immediately and be disposed of by vote.

(The motion was seconded.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: The motion is the matter of dismissal for non-compliance be taken up immediately. Are you ready for the question? All those in favor? Opposed? The "ayes" have it.

We are ready for the report of the Compliance Committee, and their recommendation in regard to certain members of the organization whom they find to be in non-compliance.

The result of the last ballot is:

Yes: 168.

No: 45.

The 168 votes being the necessary two-thirds majority, the motion is carried.

We are ready for the report of the Compliance Committee.

13. Report of Constitutional Compliance Committee.

CLARENCE P. HOUSTON (Tufts College): I assume it is the duty of the Compliance Committee to make a general report to the convention at this time. I realize the shortness of time, and, therefore, will be as brief as possible. But in order that you may have as much in-

formation as we can give you in order to cast your vote on the motions which will be made before the conclusion of the report, it would seem to me, or I hope it will be helpful to attempt to give you a general idea of what the Committee has been up to during the last two years in general, and more particularly in this last year.

I shall have to say at the outset that this program of the National Collegiate Athletic Association is an interesting and a courageous one, and in some aspects of it I have been glad to take a small part in it.

I think the first question which might logically be presented is whether or not there is at this time a general understanding of the provisions of the Code. I think it can be said with reasonable accuracy that for a new law which was adopted two years ago — when consideration is given to all the rules and regulations which college professors and athletic directors and administrators have to deal with — there is a surprising understanding of the main provisions of the Sanity Code by the membership of this Association. That did not come about overnight. However, I think it took the first year for the members to really begin to understand what the Code was about, and it came about in part from the fact that your Committee, this Committee, has in its files at the present time answers to questions in the form of question and answers from every one of the 270 institutions that comprise the active membership of the Association. In addition, and during the last year, a supplemental request for information was sent to 101 institutions. As a result of that questionnaire, we have in our hands answers from 95 institutions. Five institutions are held up for one reason or another. There is only one that is not yet heard from. In fact our experience has been that almost without exception a request by this N.C.A.A. Committee to an institution, either to its president or its athletic director or its faculty representative, has been promptly and completely answered in the main. In other words, the cooperation of the membership of the Association in aiding the Compliance Committee to do what I think you agree is sometimes an embarrassing task, namely, the prying into the affairs of an institution which in some respects are private in their nature, has been a most refreshing and, to me, amazing experience.

The attitude of fine cooperation which you and your associates have given the Committee is very greatly appreciated.

At this time we have to give consideration for a few moments to the general acceptance of the Code by its members outside of any present controversy. Many college presidents, administrators, have written to the Committee expressing a desire that this Code should be carried out, that it should be accepted, that it should be complied with, and, of course, furthermore, this question has come to the Committee many times: What is the penalty for failure to comply? I think it is a fact that many of your institutions, when the Code was adopted, took steps which were difficult for you in rearranging your program in order to bring your institution into compliance. But the attitude as expressed to this Committee over a period of the last two years is that the N.C.A.A. needs a Code, it needs to be enforced, and it needs to carry out this program.

Now, of course, one question has come, as I tried to say a few minutes ago: What will happen if I do not subscribe to the Code? And it is perfectly obvious to you, I am sure, that the only penalty contained in this organization is that provided by the Constitution, namely, expulsion from the Association, or suspension.

The Committee has been urged and has been criticized for its slowness to act. Time and again they are saying, "When are you going to do something?" "Will the Association really do anything about it?" So the Committee has held itself back to be sure that the pro-

cedures which it adopted were orderly and every opportunity was given to the administrators to bring their institutions into compliance, and when an institution so said, and that was certified to in writing by the president of the institution, the Committee took its word.

Of course, there has been great question about that, namely, whether or not the institutions in submitting the information to this Committee have been truthful. I have no answer to make to that, except this: The questionnaires that have been furnished by you have in all cases been certified to in writing by the president and the athletic director of the institution, and in approximately a hundred cases, they have been certified to in writing by the president, the athletic director, and the football coach.

Again I leave it to your judgment as to whether or not those gentlemen would or would not tell the truth in the furnishing of rather critical information concerning their athletic policies and programs so far as financial aids were concerned.

Now, that brings us to just one detail which you may or may not be interested in. The sending of the supplemental request for information this fall was a result of considerable pressure upon the Committee to the effect that the situation was worsening rather than bettering, and the Committee had to do something about it.

About the only thing we could do in that connection was to send out this questionnaire to those institutions about whom a complaint had been filed, or in some cases because of the general national interest in that particular institution. We were criticized for that. Some institutions criticized us for including them on the list; other institutions criticized us for not including them on the list. We exercised our discretion in that particular manner.

Very briefly, the results of that supplemental request for information were as follows. I will give you the substance of the question.

No. 1. Does any member of your athletic staff solicit, with the offer of financial aid, the attendance at your institution any prospective student? In other words, does any member of the athletic department give an offer? There was some misunderstanding on the part of four or five institutions in that group as to the answer, which has not yet been straightened out and which I had to determine as in the affirmative column.

Institutions said that their athletic representatives did not give offers to prospective students.

The next question had to do with this troublesome question of alumni aid and alumni agencies giving money to athletes and was, in substance, this: Do you know of any individual or group of alumni or other agency which is financing or giving aid to athletes at your institution which is not administered by the regular agency for the granting of aid to all students in your school?

The answer to that was 90 in the negative column, and 5 in the affirmative column.

Let me go afield for just a moment. It is a fact that in several institutions there has been a situation apparently where various outside organizations have been financing and giving aid to athletes without any approval or action by the institutions. In those cases that have come to our attention and which have been disclosed by the institution or otherwise and we have called their attention to it, they say they have taken steps to bring that financial aid into the treasury of the institution and have it given out and administered by the regular agency in the institution. Those schools seem to feel reasonably thankful, because it has enabled them to get possession and authority over funds which they previously didn't have.

The next question had to do with work, and was put in specifically because the gossip and rumor and mistrust and suspicion which sur-

rounds this problem of work was of serious concern to the Committee. It was said loosely that they set up a work program with clock winding for eight-day clocks, and so forth. So we put this question into this questionnaire: Do you know of any case in which any of these men receive pay for work not actually performed?

Eighty-nine answered "No"; there were four blanks, and two doubtful.

The next question — and this is always a troublesome question. Of course your Committee is set up to handle complaints which have come from anybody with a reasonable basis of evidence. It is true, I think that institutions are very slow to complain about other institutions. On the other hand, the only source for most of such information, would be from institutions that are members of this Association. So we put this question: Is any case known to the signers of this questionnaire of any violation of the National Collegiate Athletic Association Code by another member institution?

The answers to that were eight in the affirmative and 90 in the negative. In the case of the affirmative answers, we have taken immediate steps to obtain the information, of course not disclosing the names of the institution or individual in any case who have supplied the information.

The last and remaining question had to do with (and this was fundamental) the list of men on varsity and football teams who received financial aid in excess of tuition and incidental fees without including the work program. Forty-three of these institutions give no aid in excess of tuition and incidental fees; 50 do give aid, justified in most cases by high scholarship or by work programs. The average grant for each term is somewhere between \$350 and \$400.

That concludes the questionnaire.

Now, another question seems to be uppermost in the minds of many, namely, are you making any investigations as to conduct of the athletic programs? So far, the Compliance Committee has made investigations of 39 different institutions which are members of the Association. In some cases there has been more than one investigation of each institution. Of these 39 investigations which we have made either through a paid investigator or simply, as in most cases, by direct correspondence with the institution, I shall have to say that it seems to me the general attitude as I see it is that an institution which is complained about likes to take, as soon as possible, all reasonable steps, if there is any basis for the complaint, to remedy the situation.

Only in three cases of those 39 so far has it been necessary to turn over to the Panel for an investigation by a subcommittee cases of complaints which cannot satisfactorily, so far as we believe, be disposed of.

Let me say in connection with those investigations that our attitude has tried to be this: You do have situations where an institution, or institutions are complained about several times, and I think we come to a point where the only satisfactory conclusion, or the only satisfactory action to take is to go (as one institution has asked a committee of the panel to do) and examine the situation in that institution for the protection of the institution provided the institution is, as it believes itself to be, in accordance with the Code.

Now, I shall have to say that there is a lot of "chasing rainbows" in this business. Many of these complaints, when we chase them down and get an answer from the institution, which, so far as we can tell, appears to be a complete and true answer, have little basis for the complaints in question. On the other hand, we have thought it was helpful in the disposing of those complaints to advise the complainant of the final disposition of the particular case.

The newspapers are a prolific source of information, and the Compliance Committee has placed in its hand, through its Chairman, a considerable number of comments by newspaper men concerning violations of the Code. I think in every case that has come to us we have taken the matter up with the institution, or in the first instance, if the castigation was in too general terms, as it was quite likely to be, asked the newspaper in question if they could furnish any substantiating information concerning the statement which they have made. In the cases in which there has been a satisfactory answer, we have notified, so far as we could, the newspapers of the answer. In some cases, they have printed retractions. They have not made the headlines when it came to retraction, and the only effect of that, is that the particular sports writer has had a little more interest in the Code, having found that this procedure was being followed.

Of course, I think I shall have to say so far as I have observed, the attitude of the press has not been one of enthusiasm for the Code or for its adoption or as to its compliance, and at the outset it was almost derisive in its character.

There is still no enthusiastic cooperation, so far as I have read, by the newspapers. I think I have noted within the last six months somewhat of a change; at least they do now talk about the Sanity Code and they do refer to it as to whether institutions are or are not in compliance. In other words, the publicity program, just among us members of the N.C.A.A. in connection with the Code, what it's supposed to do, what its benefits are, and so forth, has been practically negligible.

Now, gentlemen, as the formal part of the report of this Committee it is true that I have to make certain motions. Before I do that, may I just outline the procedure that has been followed, so I hope it will be clear to you.

You perhaps remember that the Constitution and the Executive Regulations, taken together, have been held to provide this procedure: These motions for termination, in order to be made in compliance with the provisions of the Constitution, had to be made more than four months before this meeting. I will, if necessary, produce evidence to that effect. Secondly, the matter must be considered by the Council, which consists of the eight district vice-presidents, the vice-presidents at large, and the officers of the Association. If it receives the approval of the Council, it then must further, in order to satisfy the provisions of the Constitution, be approved by the Executive Committee. Those steps are necessary before the motion can properly be presented on the floor, and at the proper time I will call upon the Secretary to present those motions. But before I do that, I would like, to ask Ralph Aigler if he would be kind enough to supplement this rather general (and I am sorry to say, in my case, somewhat rambling) report of the activities of the Committee.

MR. AIGLER: As Mr. Houston has explained, this is a supplement. Perhaps it is really not entitled to be designated as in any sense a continuation of the report of the Compliance Committee in any official way.

There are certain factual matters to which I shall refer that you must not confuse with the factual evidence determined by the Compliance Committee. These factual matters are used in what I shall have to say as illustrative of points of view to which, I think I am entirely correct in saying, that the members of the Compliance Committee subscribe.

It is well that the questions before us today should be debated fully. That is in the American tradition. Winston Churchill recently said, "The argument against the welfare state is intricate and ill-adapted to political campaigning." Perhaps, at least as one may judge from

newspaper comment, the case against subsidies for athletes is not popular. Fortunately, this discussion is not a part of a political campaign, and doubly fortunate it is that those with whom the decision rests are a highly selected group.

I dare say that we have substantially unanimous agreement on two basic propositions. The first of these is that the movement that culminated in the amended Constitution two years ago was under way for years and gradually grew out of a realization that something had to be done to preserve intercollegiate athletics as an activity of educational institutions in which many see elements of real value.

The second proposition on which I am sure we have substantial agreement is that we had open to us just three courses of action: (1) the abolition of intercollegiate athletics, a remedy comparable to burning down the house because it is infested with rodents; (2) the throwing off of all restraints in the fields of recruiting and subsidizing, letting the sky be the limit, and (3) the drawing of a line somewhere between those two extremes, outlawing certain things while sanctioning, either expressly or impliedly, many others, the aim being to preserve athletics by eliminating or minimizing the abuses.

The first course obviously would eliminate all problems of enforcement. The second would accomplish the same result, but would almost certainly arrive at the same end — the abolition of intercollegiate athletics as appropriate and justifiable phases of collegiate activity. I maintain that schools and colleges have no legal or moral right to engage in the business of public entertainment. With all restraints thrown off, those institutions in localities and with the facilities for production of large incomes would, of course, be in the position in a free market to hire the best teams, and standings at the end of the season would be determined thereby. So the first and second possible courses of action bring us to the same result — no intercollegiate athletics, hence no problems of enforcement.

This Association, as you well know, pursued the third course. That inevitably posed problems of rule drafting and, as a natural consequence, the problems of enforcement.

The rules we incorporated in our Constitution probably satisfied no one completely. As is usual in such instances, the resulting product was a compromise. Two years of deliberation and drafting were consumed in arriving at the end result which we now find in our Constitution. The terms of the new rules must not be out of reason, for they were adopted by a two-thirds vote of the membership represented at a meeting when it was well known in advance that the proposals would be up for adoption or rejection.

It is unnecessary to discuss the content of these rules. It will suffice to observe that they sanction many types of financial aids to athletes, but with safeguards designed to keep intercollegiate athletics in proper relation to the main function of colleges and universities, which, as I said before, I assumed we all will agree is education.

I would be among the first to admit that an honest observance of these rules would mean poorer performances on the fields, on an absolute standard, of the teams representing our institutions. I submit, however, that on a relative basis the net results will come out just the same. In other words, if Institution X, with any restrictive rules or operating in a group in which the rules are disregarded, comes out near the top of its group, then if all the members of that group are living up to the same rules, X's position will normally be just about the same. The most vicious element in intercollegiate athletics is the unwillingness of institutional communities — students, alumni, faculty, etc. — to be content with the caliber of teams that can be produced from the student bodies that naturally gravitate to those institutions. A football game between Universities A and X so located

by teams made up entirely of young men who enrolled without any semblance of such pressure as to amount to recruiting in the offensive and with such backgrounds as to make them natural rivals, played sense, and without anyone receiving any financial aid in the slightest degree attributable to athletic prowess, would not be without interest to the supporters of the two institutions and even to the public. Indeed, it might well be fully as exciting as if the teams were extravagantly recruited and subsidized, and upwards of 95 per cent of the spectators would not be aware of the fact that the technical excellence of the performance was the least bit inferior.

The chances, too, are that the result of the game would be the same as if both universities had beaten the bushes for material and then made the financial paths easy.

No one can give a dependable answer to the question: How common is subsidization in the offensive sense as declared by rules? Only the most naive would say that there is none. At the same time one may justly question whether it is as common as popularly supposed. Of course, one must set aside those institutions in which the practice is official; there it is a matter of record, though it should be noted that at such places no records are kept as to aids beyond those officially sanctioned and awarded.

Included usually in the list of subsidized players are all those who are known to have received forbidden offers from some one or more institutions to which they did not go. It is commonly assumed that if a young man was offered aid by one university and he enrolled at another, he must be getting as much, or probably more, at the latter. It is too often overlooked that a young man may prefer to attend A rather than X, even though the latter, directly or indirectly, may have offered to make his path an easier one. After all, is it not only fair to recognize that it is not unusual, even for an athlete, to want an education that promises to fit him for his contemplated life work and that he may pick his college because of the educational opportunities it offers and also because of family ties, teacher influences, etc.? A young man recently graduated told me that after his freshman year at A, where he was assigned by the Navy for training, he had refused an offer by an alumnus of X of two hundred dollars a month if he would transfer to the latter institution. He added that nothing he could say to that alumnus would convince him that his staying at A was because that was where he wanted to stay, not because some other better competing proposition had been made.

Since this meeting started, I was told by a man — you all know whom; I am not going to name him, but he was, I think, an unanimous selection as an All-American football player — who said that in his student days he was offered a thousand dollars a year if he would attend a certain college or university. He said he didn't accept that offer, but he went to another institution where he did make the team and did win his All-American laurels.

He said at the institution to which he went, he got no financial help whatever. He said, "I worked my way through, and indeed I was fortunate enough to be able to help, in a slight degree, even, some of my teammates."

Another factor that must be taken into account is the natural disposition of young men to boast or to provide what seem to be plausible explanations for decisions. Everyone can understand the temptation to a young man in his teens to give his associates and friends the idea that he was so good that perhaps not merely one but many universities wanted him badly enough to pay him. A simple factual example of recent happening will better illustrate what I am saying.

A story published in the New York University *Alumni Bulletin* stated that an outstanding member of the freshman football squad

at that university had explained to his coach over the telephone that he was not appearing for any more practice because "the deal had been closed, and he was transferring to the University of Michigan." That story evoked notices in many newspapers from coast to coast, usually with a query by some cynical sportswriter as to what was Michigan going to do about it.

Immediate inquiry of the athletic staff elicited no information about Mathews, the boy's name. No one seemed to have heard of him; at any rate, no such person had reported his presence to any member of the staff. Inquiries were then directed to the office of the University Registrar. It was quickly determined that no such person had enrolled, and a search of the files disclosed that not only had no application ever been received from him, but there had been no correspondence or inquiries from him. I have heard rumors that the boy has gone into professional athletics, but I cannot assert that as a fact.

If I have not already made it sufficiently clear, let me say most emphatically that I am not trusting enough to think that there are no violations of the N.C.A.A. Code. Some of you know I have been a lawyer of some experience for a great many years, and if I were of a naturally trusting disposition, I think that experience would have shaken it out of me. Indeed, there may be some at my own institution; but I want to say with equal emphasis that if there are any such they are unknown to those of us in positions of responsibility, and this does not mean that we are content to sit back with eyes shut and ears closed.

Press comment and material published in periodicals not infrequently indicate that illegal subsidization is the common thing rather than the exception, and the impression is given that the writers have knowledge of facts substantiating such comment. In no instance within my knowledge has any such writer been willing to disclose his information. I can readily understand that reluctance. Athletic administrators, however, may then justly resent the charge or implication of such writers of hypocrisy and dishonesty in that those administrators take no steps to clean up the situations of which the writer claims knowledge but which he refuses to divulge.

The same observation might be made with reference to members of the staffs of member institutions. We have in our various counties throughout the country law enforcement officers, prosecuting attorneys, as they are usually called, states attorneys, or whatever it may be. Their task is to see to it that the laws are enforced — by that I mean enforcing of criminal laws. Some of these counties have populations up into the millions. How do those prosecuting attorneys proceed to enforce the laws of the state which it is their sworn duty to enforce? They have to have from some sufficiently interested and public-minded citizen some information on which they can start their investigations and the proceedings that follow.

I earlier mentioned the difficulties of enforcement of rules, problems of fact finding. So far as institutional aids are concerned, one can readily get the information. When aids are awarded unofficially out of collected funds, one can often get at the truth; too many people are involved to keep the fund and the practices a secret. That leaves the aids that come from individuals. Here even a professional investigator may be a bit baffled. But there are ways of getting at facts even in these situations.

When I hear a report that so-and-so is being sent to college by some enthusiastic alumnus, naturally my first inquiry, after learning that the boy's family probably cannot afford to pay his way, has to do with his mode of life at the university. I well remember hearing such charges as to a young man who attained some prominence as an athlete. When I found that he was earning his board by washing

dishes in a sorority kitchen, I felt that further investigation was probably unnecessary, for I figured that any boy who was earning his board by such unattractive employment surely could hardly be the beneficiary of easy money.

I also recall a remark made by a professional investigator who had been engaged to investigate the status of certain hockey players. He said that, as soon as he observed that five of the boys were living in a basement room under conditions he thought almost unendurable, he considered further study almost superfluous.

It is perfectly possible for a university, a conference, or the N.C.A.A., through appropriate agencies and perhaps with the assistance of trained professional investigators, to examine situations in that way. The resources of the boy himself and of his family can be ascertained with some degree of accuracy, and certainly his mode of life at his institution is discoverable. The Compliance Committee of this Association has pursued such inquiries and has not hesitated to hire competent investigators.

It is always pertinent to inquire regarding the geographical origins of the members of teams. But it is equally pertinent and also important to notice whether the number of athletes from a given area is markedly out of keeping with the non-athletes. Just as a law school, for example, may attract students from wide areas, so an institution's athletic standing may draw athletically minded young men.

A common charge is that employment of athletes is often not honest; that is, that the work is not actually performed, or, if it is, that the pay is not in keeping with the going rate in the area. This again is a matter that can be investigated.

Some months ago, Mr. Wilson, the Commissioner of our Conference, where employment is common among athletes, decided to look into that situation. He engaged the services of men with a background of FBI experience, and told them to make such study as their ingenuity suggested. They made their investigations at a number of our members. Their visits were unannounced. Remember that to start with they had the detailed annual report regarding employment by athletes required by our conference. They examined the employment not of every athlete at any one institution, but of a sufficient number to reach more or less general conclusions. They discovered some irregularities, all of a minor character. They reported, however, that in general the jobs were real, that the men did their work and that the compensation was regular; that is, in keeping with the work done.

It is often pointed out that a young man cannot do his college work and take part in athletics, particularly football, and have time enough to earn honestly his way. With this I agree. A student must have some unusual ability, for instance, as a musician, to be able to do that. But the fault, indeed the vice, is in the calm assumption that athletes come to the campus stripped bare of financial resources that are perfectly proper. I use the word "vice" because this general attitude has developed in men of athletic ability the idea that none of the responsibility of support is their own or their families. Many families, even of modest means, can contribute something to a son's college education, and, thank God, there are not a few with whom it is a matter of pride to do so. Many employers are eager to give jobs to earnest young men in vacation periods; and it is, of course, needless to point out that the Code of this Association permits some aids. I wonder how many there are in this room, one-time athletes or not, who honestly earned at least a part of their way through college. I know I did, and it was hard work, too.

Let us, then, approach the consideration of the questions before

this Association calmly, not emotionally, and with due recognition of facts.

Let there be no mistake about this: It would be silly for anyone to think that this organization or any other organization can formulate any set of rules which will never be violated. It would be equally silly for one to think that all violations, when they happen, would be known or discovered. One must remind oneself that neither this Association nor our Conferences nor our member institutions have the benefit of governmental powers in getting at facts. Even the state, with power to subpoena witnesses, to compel answers by contempt proceedings and to insist upon truthful answers by threat of prosecution for perjury, often falls short of perfect enforcement of its laws which, after all, are merely rules. No machinery could possibly be set up by us that would attain that goal. Indeed, if any considerable percentage of member institutions were determined to flout the rules, one might as well throw up his hands. But we are not dealing with the criminal class; our membership consists of educational institutions, and the representatives of those members are a selected group of men supposed to be leaders. Considering the nature of the membership of this Association and of their representatives, we may well feel no little chagrin if we reach adjournment in retreat from a position which after years of study and deliberation we set for ourselves for the reason that we cannot or will not live up to our own rules.

PRESIDENT LEIB: Mr. Stewart, do you desire to address the group?

MR. STEWART: I think the activities of the Committee have been covered, and in the interest of time, I will not add anything further.

PRESIDENT LEIB: Mr. Houston, Chairman of the Committee.

MR. HOUSTON: I understand the position is to proceed with these matters irrespective of the luncheon period. If that is your will, I will proceed with this part of the report, which for myself is an unpleasant matter. I have clearly the duty of the Committee under your Constitution and regulations to present to the Association institutions that have been found to be in violation of the provisions of the Code. Many of the representatives of these institutions are, or perhaps rather were, my friends.

I shall have to go through the technical procedures which have been followed in order to give you information, and for the purposes of the record. The Constitution provides that in order to make a motion or motions for the termination of membership, a notice in writing must be given to the president of each institution four months prior to the date of the convention. Also, a similar notice must be given to the Secretary prior to the four months' period. Also, a notice of the motion must be sent to the member institution in the official notice of the convention. In connection with the first two notices, namely, the notice to the president of the institution in each case by September 1, 1949, this letter was sent by registered mail, return receipt requested, and in each case I have in the files a return receipt from the president of each institution dated within that period of time.

I may say that the procedure followed by the Committee with reference to institutions which appear to be not in compliance with the Code was as follows: At the beginning of 1949, or thereabouts, 20 institutions were found not to be in compliance with the Code and were so notified and were given until July 1st of 1949 to bring their institution into compliance, or rather notify us that their institution would be in compliance by September 1st of that year. In the case of 13 institutions, such information was filed with the Committee over the signature of the president of the institution; namely, that by September 1, 1949, those institutions would bring their policies and

programs into conformity with the provisions of the N.C.A.A. Code. This same notice, as it will appear, or similar notices were given to institutions in question, namely, the seven who did not advise the Compliance Committee that they would bring their institutions in conformity with the Code. Therefore, you will notice that the information is given as of September 1, 1949, and the noncompliance is found as of that time.

These motions are now made in accordance with the executive regulations jointly by the members of the Compliance Committee and the Chairman of the Panel. Therefore, in following the regulations, it was necessary that those motions be presented before the Council, at which some of the institutions requested an opportunity to come in and be heard. It was thereafter necessary, provided the approval of the Council was obtained through the presentations of such motions, that the Executive Committee give its approval, and, therefore, at this point and for the purposes of the record again, I will ask the Secretary to read such motions if any were passed by the Council and the Executive Committee.

MR. WILSON: The following motion has been proposed by the Constitutional Compliance Committee and the Chairman of the Panel: Motion to terminate the membership of the seven named institutions which as of September 1, 1949, failed to maintain athletic standing in accordance with the Constitution of the N.C.A.A. The N.C.A.A. Council on Thursday, January 12th, voted that the Council accepts and approves the recommendations of the Constitutional Compliance Committee and the Chairman of the Panel and presents it to the Executive Committee for that Committee's approval of the presentation of the motion to the annual meeting of the Association.

On the same day, Thursday, January 12th, the Executive Committee voted that the Council having accepted and approved a recommendation from the Constitutional Compliance Committee and the Chairman of the Panel, and such recommendation having been presented to the Executive Committee for approval of its presentation to the annual meeting of the N.C.A.A. January 14, 1950, it is voted that the approval of the Executive Committee is hereby given and that the representatives of the institutions concerned be notified by the Secretary.

MR. HOUSTON: Now, I propose to adopt the following plan of procedure unless there is objection. I will present to you the facts upon which the findings were made in connection with each of the seven institutions, and I assume that the institutions are here and want to be heard on this matter, and if it is agreeable that they can be heard at the end of my presentation, I will proceed in that fashion.

PRESIDENT LEIB: Is there any objection to this procedure? If not, we shall proceed as suggested.

MR. HOUSTON: I will attempt to summarize for you the main points, the main facts upon which the findings have been made. The main points are supported by letters from the institution or to the institution in question, which I think I have here in my possession to substantiate the conclusions and the points and the facts which were found.

I assume perhaps there is no objection as to any order in which these cases have been taken up; therefore, I will just take them up as they happen to come out of the bag. The first one is the University of Maryland. In answer to the questionnaire propounded to the University of Maryland in 1948, they failed to list any football players as in receipt of financial aid in excess of tuition.

On December 17, 1948, and again on March 1, 1948, they were informed that they were granting aid, in accordance with the answers to their questionnaire, in excess of those permitted by the Code.

In a letter dated April 27, 1949, this institution stated through their president that they believed the University of Maryland was in compliance with the Code.

On July 18th they were asked whether or not they intended to be in compliance by September 1 of '49.

On August 24th, they again answered to the effect that they believed they would be in compliance.

On August 26, 1949, they were asked for a definite statement as to their intentions, and were informed that otherwise they would be held to be non-compliance. No answer was forthcoming, that is, prior to September 1st. On September 1st, they were given formal notice for termination of membership.

Now, in connection with the other institutions who are noncomplying, we required an unqualified statement from the institution in question that they were in compliance by September 1st. In other words, our finding in this case is based upon the fact that we do not have from the University of Maryland an unqualified statement to the effect that the institution was in compliance on September 1st.

If I may say so, Dr. Byrd appeared before the Council day before yesterday and stated in his opinion, if I quote him correctly, they believed they are in compliance, that they could be in compliance, but still I shall have to say that I didn't get that unqualified statement which the Committee has required.

That is all the evidence in connection with this institution. If you have any questions, will you be good enough to bear them in mind until I have finished with the seven institutions?

The next institution is The Citadel. This institution stated where athletic ability was affected, in answer to the 1948 questionnaire, student aid was limited to institutional fees. They did not list any members of their football squad as receiving any aid in excess of tuition. I think there is no question but what in connection with that institution, institutional fees include board and room. If I am wrong, you correct me.

On January 19, 1949, they were requested to elaborate on these two matters, namely, institutional fees and a list of their members.

On January 26th they answered, all men receiving aid would be required to earn all in excess of tuition.

On April 14th, this institution was asked, in view of their apparent noncompliance, what their intentions might be.

Their answer dated April 16, 1949, was to the effect that while at present they could not state they were complying, they would attempt to do so in the future.

Again on June 23rd, they wrote that every effort would be made to comply. However, this was qualified by the statement that it was doubtful whether any student could earn his room and board.

On July 16th, they informed this office that 20 students were affected by the room-and-board problem. They also expressed the hope that any disciplinary action could be deferred until after the next annual N.C.A.A. meeting.

This institution was given formal notice on September 1, 1949, for termination.

In connection with the motion involving The Citadel and Virginia Military Institute and Virginia Polytechnic Institute, I think I may say — and I hope I express their attitude just for a moment in order that you may better get the picture — that their problem is, being a military institution, with long hours of drill, laboratory, and so forth, it is very difficult for them to get work for their particular athletes.

That completes the record in the case of The Citadel.

The next institution involved is Villanova College. We received their questionnaire on November 9, 1948.

To the question, "What is the limit of the student aid when athletic ability is a factor?" they answered, "A full sustaining scholarship."

They failed to list any men receiving aid in excess of tuition, but stated their files were open to proper accredited agencies on payment of one dollar.

On February 14, 1949, they were requested to send additional information in regard to these two matters.

On April 4th they requested a copy of our February letter as they had misplaced it. This was sent the same day.

On May 27, 1949, they informed this office that a full sustaining scholarship consisted of board, room, tuition and fees, and that there were 39 recipients thereof, but they failed to list their names or their scholastic standing.

On June 2, 1949, they were asked for additional information concerning the basis of these awards.

On July 19, 1949, we requested an answer to our June letter, and stated their status was pending until such answer was received. None has been received to this date, that is, September 1, 1949. On September 1, 1949, they were given formal notice of termination.

We had little or no information up to September 1st. In order to get all the facts before you, I think I shall have to take the time to read some of this correspondence. I do not see Villanova's representative here, although he may be; but President McGuire of Villanova appeared before the Council and stated that steps were being taken by his institution looking toward complete compliance with the N.C.A.A. Code. I do not recall that he stated the exact date when they would be in compliance, but I think he expected in the reasonably immediate future. His reasons for failure to answer the letter and give the information appeared in a letter addressed to me on September 8th.

(Mr. Houston read the correspondence.)

MR. H. C. BYRD (University of Maryland): May I ask a question if our good friend will not object? I believe, Professor Houston, that it is not necessary for you to proceed at length to justify your opinion or the opinion of the Compliance Committee that these seven institutions should be suspended from this Association, and I believe, speaking for this one, anyway, and I believe speaking for all seven, that we are perfectly willing to accept the fact that in your judgment and in the judgment of your Committee all of us should be suspended from the National Collegiate Athletic Association, and if they are willing to accept that, I would suggest that you dispense with the further lengthy talk about all of them and proceed to put your motion that they be suspended, and let them vote on it.

MR. HOUSTON: President Byrd, thank you. That will enable me to shorten up substantially the presentation, because, of course, obviously you are entitled to have the facts upon which this is founded. Then unless I hear further objection, at the close of the presentation of each case, I will assume from your statement unless it is objected to, that there is no question raised as to the question of fact, namely, that the institution is admittedly not in compliance.

MR. BYRD: I didn't say that, sir. What I said was that we do not question the integrity of your position, that we believe in your integrity in stating that it is the opinion of this Committee that this group should be suspended from this organization. I did not say that we admitted we were not in compliance. I think that is a matter for future determination. You are placing a motion before this group. Your statements have been a procedure of convincing this group that your opinion and the opinion of the Committee were justified. We grant that, sir, without any further ado.

MR. HOUSTON: Do you speak for the other institutions?

MR. BYRD: Unless there is some objection, I believe I do.

MR. HOUSTON: Then I will present no further evidence in connection with Villanova except —

MR. COLGATE W. DARDEN (University of Virginia): I wish you would read to this group your position on the University of Virginia.

MR. HOUSTON: I don't readily have access to that. I don't see why I should have to pick out the University of Virginia and not proceed with the ones as they happen to come up.

MR. BYRD: It would seem to me, Mr. President, that the time for the University of Virginia to present its case and to make its statement is after you have finished, and in talking on the motion.

MR. HOUSTON: At the outset I suggested I would follow the procedure of presenting the case for the institutions, and then the institutions in question would present their cases. There was no objection to that. I don't want to be squeamish about this. I would just as soon quit and present the University of Virginia now, but I would like to follow the procedure which I outlined.

MR. BYRD: I was suggesting it as a matter of saving time.

PRESIDENT LEIB: That procedure having been suggested at the beginning, and anxious as all of us are to get along with the business before the meeting, and in view of Professor Houston's statement that he can finish within a short time, I think it would be better to allow him to continue with the presentation of the material as he has planned, and the Chair so rules.

MR. HOUSTON: With reference to the University of Virginia, I can be very brief, because in connection with their questionnaire, the University has answered as follows.

(Mr. Houston read the facts of the case.)

The next case is Boston College.

(Mr. Houston read the evidence in the case.)

On September 1st they were given formal notice for termination of membership.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

(Mr. Houston read the evidence in the case.)

Their representatives appeared before the Council.

That completes the seven.

I think it is in the record, but if it isn't, I will put in the record for the purpose of presenting the matter before you, that a motion is made for the termination of the membership of these seven institutions for failure to maintain the athletic standing in accordance with provisions of the Constitution.

Are there questions to me concerning whether or not there is non-compliance as of September 1st in connection with these institutions?

MR. BYRD: I would like to ask a question on that. Is an institution, if it is in compliance on this day and at this time, subject to a punishment which would be meted out because it was not in compliance, say, on the first day of last August?

These rules, as I understand them, do not provide that the institution shall be punished for what happened last August, but provide for a vote on what is the situation immediately. Will you answer that, please, sir?

MR. HOUSTON: I will answer it the best I can. It seems to me it is a matter for your consideration as to whether or not since September 1, 1949, they have brought their institution into compliance with the Code. Of course, you have this constitutional provision which requires that for such notice to be made it must be made four

months prior to the holding of the convention. Therefore, that is fixed.

Now, in connection with that question, the Compliance Committee was forced to take the attitude that it is a fact-finding tribunal. The Compliance Committee has no power to penalize or punish the institutions in question. All it can do is find the facts as of a certain date. It waited until the last possible date it could in connection with these institutions, because it believed, and should have believed, it was only fair to give the institution every chance it could to bring the institution into compliance. Therefore, I suppose it presents this question in addition: Is it fair to the other institutions who have brought their schools into compliance? We have to proceed in that manner.

If there are no further questions, that concludes the report of your Compliance Committee.

PRESIDENT LEIB: You have heard the motion which has been made by the Chairman of the Compliance Committee. Is there a second?

(The motion was seconded.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: It is moved and seconded. To summarize it roughly, it is to terminate the membership of the seven named institutions which as of September 1, 1949, were considered to be in violation of the Code for failure to maintain athletic standards in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.

Before we hear from the members who desire to speak on this question, I should like to point out that it is the opinion of the Committee that these schools were, in some instances may still be, and in other instances maintain that they are not, in violation of the Code.

I should also like to point out that in case this action should be taken, it is possible for any institution upon establishing that it is in conformity with the Code and intends to conform with the Code to be reinstated through regular channels. I mention that merely to point out the actual situation.

The motion is now before you for discussion. Is there any discussion?

MR. PRITCHETT (University of Virginia): As Mr. Houston indicated, he said perhaps some of us might have been his friends, but not now. I hope that is not literally the truth.

I wish to make two general statements as briefly as possible. The only comfort I have in taking your time at this particular point of the meeting is in recognition of the fact that in 22 years in which I have attended these meetings the sum total of my statements in these open sessions have been limited to three paragraphs. Therefore, I won't feel unduly pressed for time if you will just bear with me briefly. I am not seeking any special dispensation for my institution in stating that I for one am in total agreement with all the purposes that are so obviously being sought by our regulations in the N.C.A.A. If I had not felt that way, I should not have devoted the last seven years of my life working pretty hard on this Code. I can attribute to these gentlemen who have made these exhaustive studies on the Compliance Committee, or as members of the Compliance Committee, the finest possible motives. I think they have done a splendid job. I find myself at the moment, however, in the unhappy predicament of the man who invented the guillotine. If my memory is correct, he died by the same instrument he devised.

It was my privilege two years ago as chairman of the nominating committee, after mature deliberation, to place on that committee the three gentlemen who have rendered their report. Now, having stated that, I feel that I am in thorough position to defend my own personal and official case. I don't know the answer to this entire athletic question. I wish I did. During our deliberations in past years with

the various committees on which I have had the privilege to serve, we discussed these questions backward and forward, and the biggest worry I have ever had in my mind had to do with only two factors; namely, the educational aspect of the entire matter, and, more paramount than that, the question of the students' integrity and of the institution's intentions and purposes in making possible for itself and for the individual complete reality of all the statements that it had made.

I stated the other day at a brief meeting the same thing that has dominated my attitude regarding this matter from the outset. Many of us are in institutions where now and then quite unfortunately a member of the student body is expelled for cheating. I hope I may go to the end of my career without any student being able to say to me under such unfortunate circumstances. "I cheated for myself; I am now expelled from your university. I cheated for you and you cheated for me by certain practices of evasion and subterfuge which, call them what name you wish, were, nevertheless, not in accordance with true fact."

It was stated just briefly by Mr. Houston that the University had indicated that seven of its students were receiving fees in excess of that allowed. At the time that was made, that was an absolutely correct statement, and please understand this, if we had had sufficient honesty to state what we were doing, we should do so now, and I pledge you my personal word of honor that what I am stating represents absolute fact, without any evasion.

At the University of Virginia at the present time on our varsity football squad there are 24 members who receive aid. The institution offers no form of athletic aid whatsoever. It offers no concessions and no remissions of fees. We have, however, an alumni association or committee which does offer aid in varying degrees, none of which exceeds the man's complete expenses. Eleven of those awards are on our varsity football squad, and fifteen partial awards, making a total of twenty-four.

On our other varsity squads, all included, there are three men who receive partial aid.

A statement has been placed in the newspaper recently indicating at the University of Virginia there is neither the disposition nor the opportunity to do any kind of work. That is not a complete statement of fact. These men, without exception, are perfectly willing to work, and when they can, they do, but we would be falsifying a statement if we said that he has sufficient time under the prevailing or going wage to qualify completely to merit our full approval for certification.

I stated at the outset that I believed implicitly in the nature of this organization. I do. I should consider it personally a rather tragic thing if I felt that we as an institution had to terminate our membership because of a complete unwillingness to subscribe to the regulations as written. Therefore, it had been my hope recently in requesting our president to attend this meeting that an opportunity might be given to explain our situation to the Executive Committee, and that with which it met, the Council, for the purpose of determining whether the interpretation placed on certain procedures by others, as being in completed conformity, might likewise apply in our instance. I feel that I bungled personally and completely in making this necessary appointment.

On arriving at the meeting, our president and I were told that this committee, quite properly, is constituted for one purpose, namely, to determine whether you are now in compliance with the Code. That question, therefore, admitted of only one answer, which was given in three words. "We are not." Then we left the room.

As stated to you, I don't know the answer to this question; I wish

that I did know the over-all answer. If I might paraphrase a statement, what we say here will not long be remembered, but what we do afterwards in our practice will be remembered in individual personality and character for a good many years.

I should like to be able to say to you in complete honesty we are in absolute conformity with your regulations as written. If, in the light of what I have stated to you as to the number of men who are receiving aid and the conditions under which that aid is granted, in an examination of your consciences you feel that we are at variance with acceptable practices, and that your practices are much more acceptable — and understand, I am not challenging your practices, because ways and means may be available at one institution that are not available at another — but if you feel that our attitude and our philosophy is at variance with that which you practice in spirit and in letter, then I would welcome your turning thumbs down on our statement and our position until and unless we can state in complete honesty that we are in full conformity.

I have no further statement to make than this. I believe I can tell you in absolute sincerity if there are other institutions who have made the combined efforts that have been made by our Board of Visitors in many meetings on this question, you would understand some of the problems that we face. However, I leave to your judgment as to whether or not under those circumstances we should be expelled.

If I had my way of suggesting, I would rather have it this way. As stated repeatedly from this platform on matters which are as yet undecided, should we not get all facts, study those facts and then make a decision? I should welcome a comparative study of all the forms of aid at other institutions, including amounts by way of determining whether the University of Virginia is in excess. If it is, and if it is out of line under those circumstances, I will let your own judgment and your consciences be your guide.

PRESIDENT LEIB: Is there further discussion?

D. S. McALISTER (The Citadel): I have but a few comments to make on the statements that have been presented to you by the Chairman of the Compliance Committee. I hope that it was communicated in those letters that The Citadel was fully in accord with the principles of the N.C.A.A. Code. I hope, also, that is clear to all of you, that in all of those exchanges of letters, The Citadel was doing everything possible to try and bring the college within the bounds of the Code on the quantitative basis. Our problem was purely a matter of quantity, not a matter of principle, and please understand that we are not stubborn, we are not defiant, and at this point I might inform our good friend Red Smith that we are not going to fire on Fort Sumter.

To save time and to prevent the possibility of rambling. I have a memorandum which I shall read, because it represents our careful thinking, the composite thinking of all of those at The Citadel who were charged with the responsibility of administering the college affairs.

Since the adoption by your Association of Article III, regulating financial aid to athletes, The Citadel has given much study to the provision of this Article. Special faculty committees have been appointed and the findings of these committees are approved. The position of The Citadel is set forth herein.

The Citadel endorses those principles and policies of the "Sanity Code" of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, to wit:-

1. The recognition of the principle of grants-in-aid to athletes as such in the form of athletic scholarships.

2. The principle that an athlete should be required to work to pay a part of his college expenses.

3. The principle that any and all grants-in-aid to athletes must be submitted and approved by the main committee on scholarships, loans and jobs of the college or university in order to conform to regulations.

4. The policy of requiring the College President to approve the action of his institution in the matter of financial aid to athletes.

5. The policy of prohibiting discrimination against our athletes as such in the matter of financial aid.

The Citadel has learned from experience that the "Sanity Code" restrictions as to the amount of aid that may be granted to a student work a great hardship upon the college in that certain students who must earn enough money to pay for room, board, laundry, books and uniforms do not have the free time in which to earn the required amounts.

The Schedule of Service Calls at The Citadel is such as to allocate specific duties to every cadet from reveille (6:15 a.m.) until after the last regularly scheduled class hour (4:00 p.m.) and from 6:30 p.m. until taps, identical — perhaps five minutes one way or the other — with that of the U. S. Military Academy and the U. S. Naval Academy, and I do not believe that there is a man in this room who would expect a cadet at West Point or at Annapolis to earn enough money to pay for these things that I have mentioned. We begin at 6:15 a.m., and he has duties assigned to him until 4:00 p.m. in the afternoon, perhaps 5, for most of them, and from 6:30 until he goes to bed he stays in his room to study, if he doesn't visit across the sentinel's post, or some such thing.

That is the schedule of The Citadel cadet, as it is at other military institutions.

Cadets are not permitted to leave the campus of the college from Sunday, 6:30 p.m. until after parade on Friday at about 5:30 p.m.

During the class periods (8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. and 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.) cadets who have vacant periods are required to return to their rooms for study.

While on leave on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays, cadets are required to wear the leave uniform and are not permitted to accept jobs in the city.

The military duties, such as drills, parades and guard duty consume approximately nine hours per week.

A special faculty committee was appointed by our president to study our situation, to determine how much time a student may put in in work, and this is the report of the committee:

Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays, from 4:15 p.m. to 6:15 p.m.

Friday and Saturday evenings, from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.

The committee feels that athletes should be allowed one afternoon of leisure each week (Saturday or Sunday) from 2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

After a thorough study of the working hours available, the committee finds that each cadet can put in a maximum of fifteen hours per week during those weeks that he is not engaged in team practice. During the fall quarter football candidates cannot work. After the close of the regular schedule of games, cadets are placed under special tutors, which is a regular program for all cadets, to prepare for examinations which begin about December 12th each year.

Spring football practice covers a six weeks' period. There remain approximately thirteen weeks during which a cadet can work. A total of one hundred and ninety-five hours' work can be put in as a maxi-

mum. Our rate of pay will average 75 cents per hour. The total earning, therefore, would be \$146.25 per session per student.

For many students who engage in winter and spring sports the working hours available will be cut down accordingly.

The program of jobs on the campus is outlined as follows:

Intramural Sports

Management, instruction, records and preparation of areas of play.

Proctorship

Armory, gymnasium, tennis courts, and yacht basin. Barracks control is maintained by the Guard Detail on which all cadets serve, and no compensation is allowed.

Swimming Pool

Life guards, operation of filter plant, water tests and record keeping.

Information Center at Main Gate

Guides to direct visitors to individual departments and offices.

Guides to conduct visitors to points of interest on campus.

Traffic Control

Assignments on special occasions.

Maintenance

Track, tennis courts, yacht basin, stadium, practice fields and parade ground in lining off fields for intramural and intercollegiate events.

Mess Hall

Schedule of service calls allows no time for work in mess hall.

Quartermaster

Issue of uniforms, clothing, and equipment under supervision of college officials.

City Employment

Prohibited by college regulations.

Campus Representation

Prohibited by college regulations.

The Citadel is willing to support the above-mentioned five principles fully and further to be governed by the restrictions or limits provided such are attainable. The Citadel finds that these restrictions or limits cannot be met. It is a known fact that 90 per cent of our students participating in football require full aid, and the opportunities to work do not fulfill their requirements.

The Citadel has declined always to resort to such practices as assigning work and paying wages when such wages are not actually earned, as setting up abnormally high rates of pay or as establishing and conniving with outside organizations to secure payment of expenses not authorized or not earned.

The statements contained in this communication form the basis for the decision of this college not to renew its affiliation with the N.C.A.A. at this time. If and when the Constitution of the Association is changed to permit full compliance by the college without any strain on the conscience of those who administer such matters, The Citadel will be happy to renew its membership in the N.C.A.A.

Gentlemen, I might say here that if I had followed the safe course of procedure, I would have written a letter to the Executive Committee immediately after the adoption of this Code and I would have said, "Gentlemen: We regret that we must terminate our membership because we do not believe that we can measure up to the quantitative restrictions. The Citadel feels that it should be a member of a regional athletic Association; it feels that there is a place for a national athletic association; it feels that The Citadel should be a member of both, in order that it may benefit by experience, advice, and conference with you gentlemen. It feels also that it should contribute what it can to the thinking and the planning of these bodies."

I have some statements here to make which come under that category, and I can assure you that it is not taking a pot shot at anyone. I think any junior officer has a duty to perform when he receives an order from his superior to do his best to carry out that order, and if he finds that is impractical or impossible, it is his duty to report back to his superior and inform him of the fact whether his superior accepts the report or not, and it is in that light that I hope some objective criticisms of the Sanity Code will not be interpreted as of (to use slang) railing at the Code or at any of you gentlemen.

The Sanity Code has certain definite flaws in its policy concept and there are deficiencies in the executive regulations for administration.

As now interpreted, there is no limit as to the amount of aid a student may receive if he complies with the minimum standard of the so-called high scholarship factor. Also, such an award does not require the student to do any work to earn money for his expenses. However, should such a student fall below this minimum requirement (C average) his aid must be reduced to the amount of the aid allowed purely for athletic ability or promise. In most cases the student would be forced to discontinue his education entirely. This is like the old English law which placed a man in jail for not paying his debts. The student who, obviously, needs additional time for his studies must turn aside and go to work to earn the cost of his room, board and other necessary expenses disallowed by the Code.

The Code defines the word "amateur" and promptly authorizes students to participate in intercollegiate sports who do not meet the requirements of the definition.

Our institutions of higher learning are reputed to be the hallmarks of honest thinking and teaching. We are entrusted with the mental training and character building of the youth of the land.

The practice of establishing rules and then, through connivance between college athletic officials and students, to violate these rules subversively presents a mournful spectacle for the nation to view.

Young men of college age are developing their estimates of values and their standards of action. The characters of these young men are in the formative stage. No phase of their college lives is as influential as the athletic atmosphere in which they live and work. The standards they see in operation while in college become the standards by which they live.

It is a tragic breach of trust for college athletic officials to persist in the art of double dealing in the matter of financial aid. This practice has existed since the memory of living man can recall, a fact which obviously influences and blinds many men now in responsible positions of administration in the intercollegiate field today.

Basically, we have refused to adopt and make public workable standards which meet fully the needs of worthy young men who come under our trusteeship each year. The recommendations made herein as to the rule covering financial aid to athletes is adequate and workable. The student is entitled to this consideration on an open basis. The public conscience will accept it. At present, the public conscience holds us up in ridicule.

The limits of aid to an athlete as such were arrived at by compromise, which means that the limits are arbitrary. There were no questions of ethics or morals involved in this decision. The setting of such an inflexible and arbitrary limits and calling such limits by the term "standards" is ridiculous. The presumption that any such provisions would be workable over the whole area of the nation is also wishful thinking.

The executive regulations provide one penalty for non-compliance of any sort and to any degree. The procedure is clearly defined for

processing instances of violation. This procedure has not been followed in at least one known instance.

There is no provision for a positive and thorough check on each member as to compliance. There are only two means of detecting violations. First, reports direct from those institutions who have tried to comply and, upon discovery that they could not, have admitted their difficulty to appropriate authority. The full and final penalty of expulsion faces all of these very few who have been honest. In such cases, the only escape was to have compiled false information and to have induced the college president to perjure himself knowingly or unknowingly by signing the document.

The second possibility of detecting violation is that one institution may report another institution for violation. Under existing conditions it is predicted with confidence that no such reports will be filed. The reason is simple; the monitor knows full well that his institution would be reported in reprisal. The expectation that enforcement may be obtained through the practice of one institution squealing on another reduces law enforcement to a very low level.

This lack of machinery for comprehensive and independent on-the-spot inspection of each institution leaves the institution as its own judge and without a certified clean bill of health. The institution will be subject to attack from all directions and its only defense will be to issue a denial if rumors persist.

The normal development under the circumstances will be for institutions to create outside organizations or connive with those in existence to secure payments for necessary financial assistance not allowed or not paid for by the student. The destructive effect of this practice will be the driving out from under the actual control of the institutions the whole matter of financial aid to athletes. This will defeat the whole and single purpose of the Sanity Code.

The Sanity Code will not work until it has been changed to make it a sensible and workable code. It is known to all member institutions that a vast majority of students participating in intercollegiate athletics require financial assistance to the extent of their full college expenses, which include tuition, books, housing, subsistence, clothes, laundry and incidental institutional fees. Should the present code be enforced, this vast majority of students would be forced to leave our institutions. The principle of granting the needed financial assistance to an athlete as such needs no further vindication than the above-stated fact.

The following paragraph should be adopted as the single rule covering the entire field of financial aid to athletes:

"The total cost of attending a member institution will be certified to in writing, item by item, for each individual student concerned by the president and chief fiscal officer of the member institution. All items of expense directly connected with the student's attendance at the institution are authorized, which include tuition, books, housing, subsistence, clothing, laundry, hospitalization, incidental institutional fees" — and here comes one that would not be well received — "reasonable personal needs. A candidate for an intercollegiate team may accept financial aid in amounts not exceeding the total certified to him, as herein stated, without loss of eligibility for such competition."

The executive regulations enacted by the Executive Committee provide the machinery and the processes of enforcement. The regulations would be improved if the procedure in each case was mandatory and not discretionary in so many instances.

What I mean by that, gentlemen, we thought that the Panel would contact us in our case. The only contact that we have had with the Panel is I find the signature of the Chairman of the Panel at the bottom of the letter which states that we are to be put up for expulsion.

Actually, the Code ignores the existence of the several regional athletic conferences. Enforcement must be through and largely by these separate conferences. The machinery of the N.C.A.A. can serve effectively only as an appellate court. To expect the Compliance Committee to enforce the Code over the entire nation is like expecting six game wardens appointed by the President of the United States to prevent the dynamiting of fish within the continental limits of the nation.

There are just one or two things that I have to say in addition. We feel that we should be permitted to depart in peace until the time comes when The Citadel can come back and measure up to the quantitative limits set in this Code. There are certain things that have not been covered. I have heard this idea expressed, that this convention must expel the seven institutions that are up now or the Sanity Code will just go out the window. I do not think so. There are several reasons why we think that that is not true. In the first place, consideration should be given to the fact that institutions have come forward with their information and admitted that we couldn't meet these things. It is a pretty sad picture when a man can't speak honestly and without getting the full brunt of the law as if he were apprehended at lying.

The other thing is the work of surveying the entire nation as to the carrying out of the practice of this Code. I admit that there is difficulty in it, but the machinery has not covered the field. The survey brought up to date now covers a survey. I don't know how thorough it is; I am sure it is satisfactory to the Compliance Committee, but you have covered those aids which have been directly under the control of the college.

I know of no effort to make a comprehensive, on-the-spot study of what is being done in the way of job rates of pay and work done, nor do I know of anything that has been done to find out what these outside organizations do, and that fact is definite, that is not a rumor; practically all of us have it. We bring up for expulsion a group of people who have been called in one corner, at their own admission. That, coupled with the fact that our survey has included only football — it has not included the other sports . . . it might well be taken that this action can appropriately be abandoned because of the lack of enough experience over the entire field of this subject to cover all the major things that could now be used as subterfuges.

I would like to repeat just what my good friend, Mr. Pritchett, said. Your institution is complying completely and honestly without subterfuges in all those things and you are satisfied that it is square, then I think you are in a position to vote to expel The Citadel if you would like to. There is just one thing as far as The Citadel is concerned. We failed to get a letter in to Mr. Houston as of a certain date making a very definite, positive statement. Failing in that, that is the basis of the indictment, and, gentlemen, we decline to put down on that piece of paper information that we hoped would be accurate, but we weren't sure of.

Every statement we have made has been positive in so far as we are concerned, but, gentlemen, I leave this case in your hands.

WALTER S. NEWMAN (Virginia Polytechnic Institute): I assure you I will not ask for an indulgence of your time for more than two minutes. Virginia Polytechnic Institute is in favor of the basic principles of the N.C.A.A. We find ourselves in disagreement in terms of the present standard. I would like to make just two statements. First, I, as president of that institution, have made it my business to find out all of the aids that have gone to athletes on my campus. Before being made president, I was four years the president of the

Alumni Association, and I think I know that gang pretty well, and I can tell you in answering these statements, and sending in answers to questionnaires and letters, I was speaking for all financial aid given to athletes at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, including alumni.

The second point I would like to make is to simply reiterate that we are one of the eight military colleges of the nation, and, therefore, have a military schedule comparable to The Citadel, the service academies, etc. The only difference is that the students arise at 6:30 instead of 6:15 in South Carolina.

We have surveyed the work opportunities on our campus within the limits of the student time, and at the going rate of pay, and the student who devotes one and a half hours, which is his free time on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and all Saturday afternoons, can earn \$192 at profitable employment, if you call that profitable employment.

The other point that I would like to make is that it has been a pleasure to work with the people that have corresponded with us. They have given us opportunities, and after we have studied the opportunities, we say in all fairness that we have attempted to comply. Under our particular conditions, we cannot, with honesty.

If I may go back several centuries, we who are about to die, salute thee.

REVEREND MAURICE V. DULLEA (Boston College:) I would like to read a brief statement to you gentlemen on the attitude of Boston College in this difficulty.

Boston College's difficulty had its inception in an honest report concerning assistance given under the provisions of the Sanity Code. As far as we know, no other college has ever leveled any accusations against us. The trouble with the committee developed from the original answer to the questionnaire.

The point involved is simply this: Was Boston College justified, according to the Code, in extending aid, over and above tuition and fees, to certain freshmen, in 1948?

Boston College says that under the provisions of the Code it was justified in so doing, and the Compliance Committee says that it was not.

Undoubtedly, an honest difference of opinion exists, with Boston College maintaining that it has the right to judge itself on educational standards in relation to college entrance examinations requirements, and the N.C.A.A. Compliance Committee adopting the stand that it should be the judge and jury. Boston College simply cannot admit that a body set up for the handling of intercollegiate athletics can conceivably be more competent to judge a college's educational standards than the college itself.

Although it is embarrassing for Boston College to be placed in this position, which can be widely misunderstood, we would much rather suffer embarrassment than resort to even the slightest evasion.

If our honest report is not accepted, there apparently is nothing we can do. The college has a reputation for integrity, and we do not care to do anything which would in the slightest jeopardize our reputation and tradition, which we have zealously guarded for over three-quarters of a century.

May I say in addition that I was deeply impressed by the remarks that Mr. McAlister made at the end of his talk. May I suggest to the officers of this Association that possibly they might find a considerable body of sentiment which is in agreement on the statement that all is not as well as it might be with the principles of the Constitution.

Mr. McAlister pointed out, as was pointed out on the floor two years

ago, that the warning was disregarded, that the Constitution is really vitiated by an inherent contradiction to which no one pays attention, by specifying that only amateurs who receive no compensation may compete, and then by stating in a later paragraph that players who receive compensation may compete.

May I suggest that if you see fit to vote this afternoon against the motion presented for expulsion, this vote be taken as an instruction to the officers of the Association to re-examine their position completely.

WILLIAM COUPER (Virginia Military Institute): My name is Couper, of the Virginia Military Institute, one of the seven. The indictment has to do with conditions on September 1, 1949. The Compliance Committee issued some other regulations which I understand completely changed the case, and they have in their hands a statement from our president saying that under the changed conditions, after five or six men have achieved their seniority at the end of this year, we will be in conformance, but we want to be in with the group. I think the Compliance Committee is on trial here as well as we are, and I hope they will be grouped in with the seven and we will get to the vote. We are getting hungry, and I want something to chew on. Let's get at it.

PRESIDENT LEIB: Is there further discussion?

MR. BYRD: Mr. President and Members of this Assembly: May I disabuse you of an idea that seemed to linger in Professor Houston's mind, namely, that he might have lost some of his friends by doing an unpleasant duty. I assure you he has lost none of his friends, because those of us who have been his friends for years and years, as I have been for 25 years, believe in his integrity and believe in the integrity of the Compliance Committee, and believe that it is justified in its opinions. I think, too, that out of this swelter is going to come a lot of good, and when I say that, I think I shall illustrate it by telling you a story that one of my good Catholic friends told me in Baltimore a few days ago. He said that Pat had slept with one of his friend's wives and he was very much disposed to try to find some way of ameliorating his conscience. He went to the priest to confess. The priest, thinking that he could help the dear lady, also asked Pat who it was. "Was it Mrs. Flaherty who lives up by the high school?"

"Father, I can't answer that."

"Was it Mrs. O'Rourke, who lives down by the railroad tracks?"

"Father, I can't answer that."

"Was it Mrs. O'Grady, who lives up next to the church?"

"Father, I can't answer that."

"Well, Pat, you go out and do 30 days of penance."

Pat went out. Mike was waiting for him. "Pat," said Mike, "what did he give you?"

Pat said, "Thirty days of penance and three darned good leads."

May I differ just a bit with what my friend, Professor Houston said, when he stated that I am going to clear up the University of Maryland's case immediately. Because I want to speak for two or three minutes only on another aspect of this situation.

I believe that Professor Houston said that I had so far given no unqualified statement with reference to the University of Maryland's intentions. I read you a sentence from a letter that I wrote to him: "It is the intention of the University of Maryland to subscribe 100 per cent to whatever rules the National Collegiate Athletic Association may adopt." I had in mind one matter, and I asked the Joint Committee, I believe the Executive Committee, and the Council to clear that up, and they cleared it up to my satisfaction. So far as the University of Maryland's case is concerned, I shall say to the President

and the Secretary and the Compliance Committee that the University of Maryland is not only in compliance, but will continue in compliance no matter what may happen, whether you kick us out or not.

I am going to call to your attention just one fact: This whole question can be boiled down to just one question, to which if we find the answer, we shall have an answer for today. I do not agree with my good friend, Ralph Aigler, and sometimes I think too many lawyers are not good for any situation, but I do not agree with him when he stands up here and in a long, excellent dissertation on the value of high moral standards in athletics, compares this situation to criminal procedure. Gentlemen, this is not criminal procedure; this is a court of equity. Athletic competition is a continuous and continual court of equity in which we try to find a common ground on which all of us can stand with equal opportunity and equal privilege and equal chance of success.

We can boil this whole thing down to just one comparison. The University of Virginia has, so to speak, been in a critical position. I am going to use the University of Virginia as an example. We have been playing in athletics for 45 or 50 years. We know what the University of Virginia is doing, and we have known it all through these years. We know that we have got legitimate jobs that we can give to students who are athletes. We have those jobs because in the beginning we re-organized the University of Maryland and while it is 140-some years old, it is a comparatively new institution in its present form. We are organized almost identically along the lines of the big western universities. We have legitimate jobs that we can provide.

Now, the question that I wanted cleared up and the question that you have got to decide this afternoon is whether or not you want the rules so written that they give one institution a great advantage over another institution because the same conditions do not exist in that other institution. In other words, should the University of Virginia be crucified because the University of Maryland has a rule which is favorable to it and the University of Virginia has different conditions which make it impossible for it to achieve the same results that the University of Maryland achieves?

Let me draw you a comparison with which we have nothing to do. I understand Ohio State University has some rather unusual jobs. I have heard a good many comments about those jobs, but if Tug Wilson goes there and investigates those jobs and says that they are perfectly legitimate, I accept it as being an absolute fact and perfectly justified under the regulations of this Association. But at the same time I question a set of regulations under which Ohio State can get for itself or attract to itself a lot of good athletes and because Virginia doesn't have the same kind of conditions, would deny to Virginia the right under some other procedures to attract athletes. In other words, I am going to ask Ohio State University this question, just as I asked myself this question last fall: Does Ohio State want to vote for the expulsion of the University of Virginia when Ohio State has, I am quite sure, facilities which would enable it to take care of four or five times the number of athletes that the University of Virginia has, or has tried to help? Is that a fair and equitable proposition in this court of equity on which you gentlemen sit as judges?

That reduces this whole thing to a simple statement. Do we wish to give a further study to this question so that we can unravel the various ramifications of the question in order that we may arrive at conclusions that will give equitable opportunities to all of these students?

I plead for the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and these other institutions because, Mr. President, this organization is an educational

organization. I agree with you that you have got to have teeth in some of these regulations, but at the same time we want teeth that can be applied equitably under all circumstances.

I have never heard a better statement than Mr. Pritchett of the University of Virginia made to you gentlemen this afternoon. I ask your consideration not for the University of Maryland, because we are convinced that we are all right under present regulations, but I ask your consideration in all fairness for an institution that admittedly is honest, admittedly under its program is not doing nearly so much for athletes as some other institutions that are supposed to be in compliance and which only asks fair consideration. That is the crux of this whole question, and, gentlemen, we leave it in your hands.

PRESIDENT LEIB: Is there further discussion?

MR. SCHMIDT: I speak only because I feel that there may be a confusion of the issues. I think that the question that is important for decision here today is something more than the fate of individual institutions who have been found to be in noncompliance. It is something much broader than that; it is larger than that. We have listened here for some time to matters of extenuation. We have listened to criticisms of the Sanity Code; we have listened to situations for the improvement in administration, but the Sanity Code was crystallized by this group some two years ago. Our position was then apparent, discussion was had, the membership of the organization made its decision. Now, the question is, it seems to me, whether we are going to stand on that decision or whether we are going to retreat, and if we retreat, where we are going and when will we ever find the path back? I think the question is a very simple one that we have to decide here today aside from the personalities of any institutions involved or their representatives; it is a question, it seems to me, of simply this: Are we going to wear the red badge of courage, or are we going to show the white feather of surrender and despair?

PRESIDENT LEIB: Is there discussion? The question has been called for.

MR. HOUSTON: I feel obligated, on behalf of the Compliance Committee, because there are other members, to say that the gentlemen who spoke were very courteous with reference to the work we have tried to do, but there were some innuendoes and some suggestions if we were to take the time could be presented from the other side.

I simply say I don't want my silence on behalf of the Compliance Committee to be construed as an admission.

PRESIDENT LEIB: The question has been called for. I think you will agree we have had full and fair opportunity for debate, even with some sacrifice of comfort on our part.

The question is as to the manner in which the ballot should be taken. There are several possibilities. We have, I believe, prepared a series of ballots on which the seven institutions are listed and after their names is a space to indicate by a "Yes" or a "No" your vote so that there is an opportunity, you might say, to vote a straight ticket by going right down one line or the other or there is an opportunity if you wish to vote on the basis of individual institutions, for you to so indicate in the manner in which you mark your ballot.

The other is a roll call vote either of the group as included in the motion, or individual institutions as included in the motion. How do you wish to conduct this vote?

MEMBER: I move it be done by ballot.

(The motion was seconded.)

MR. BYRD: I doubt very seriously that that vote would be in conformity with the motion. The motion is that these seven institutions terminate, or have their membership in this organization terminated. If that membership is to be terminated in the terms of the motion, then the motion itself must be voted on, must it not?

PRESIDENT LEIB: You are correct in the statement of the motion to terminate the membership of the seven named institutions. Whether that prescribes the voting on the whole seven as one, or whether it permits the voting on the seven as individuals is a rather difficult matter for me to determine. I should like to leave that more or less to the decision of the group. We have a motion before the house which calls for a vote by ballot. I think we may vote upon that question without determining the question which is raised. All those in favor of conducting the vote by ballot please signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is carried.

MR. AIGLER: I move, in the interest of expediency and fairness to the institutions involved, and also in the interest of fairness involved if this plan is a feasible one, which I hope it will turn out to be, that the ballot contain the names of the seven institutions with appropriate opportunity with reference to each one to vote "Yes" or "No" as the case may be, which would mean, of course, carrying out the motion that has just been carried, namely, that the vote be by ballot.

These institutions are not joint in any sense. It is an individual question. Therefore, it seems to me that we should use the ballots that have been prepared along the line I have just indicated, with the names of the seven different institutions, and then appropriate brackets after each one in which you may mark your ballot either "Yes" or "No," as the case may be. That means that the roll will be called just once, and each institution through its representative will have to go through the line just once.

My motion is that the ballot be of that character.

(The motion was seconded.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: It is moved and seconded that the ballot be of the character discussed.

MR. COUPER: The seven institutions involved are of the opinion that this case is very much the same by all, and you will save a lot of time by voting on them as a group.

MEMBER: I second that.

PRESIDENT LEIB: It is moved and seconded that a substitute motion be offered permitting the institutions to be voted upon as a group, which is stated to be their desire.

The Chair wishes to observe that the ballot as provided gives an opportunity to vote upon the institutions as a group. The institutions are listed. Here you can vote for and here you can vote against the motion. You can vote on them as a group by simply putting your crosses down the line.

I thought you should know what the nature of the ballot was in passing upon this question. The motion is that a substitution motion be adopted by which the institutions shall be voted upon as a group rather than by individuals. Is there further discussion on the substitute motion? All those in favor please so indicate. Opposed. We have a counting job on our hands again. Those in favor please rise. Those opposed. The count is 103 for and 89 against. The substitute motion is carried.

Now, the next question, do you wish simply to use cards, voting "Yes" or "No," or do you prefer to accept this as satisfying the requirements as set up by you, and balloting on the group?

"Yes" is in support of the motion, which is for the termination of membership. "No" is against the motion for termination of membership. We still follow the same procedure as before. We will call the roll and you will pass to the ballot table yourself and vote on your card.

(The roll was called and the members came forward and identified themselves and deposited their ballots.)

(The motion was carried, 111 to 93, but the required two-third majority was not met and the motion was declared lost.)

MR. BYRD: I wish to submit the following: "Whereas, The Southwest Conference, the Southeastern Conference, and the Southern Conference are in sympathy with the N.C.A.A. in its efforts to raise the standards of intercollegiate athletics, and commend the N.C.A.A. for its efforts toward that end; and

"Whereas, The Compliance Committee has devoted its energies conscientiously toward the betterment of intercollegiate athletics by its interpretations of scholarship standards and principles established by the N.C.A.A., but has not studied the problem in all its aspects and ramifications relating to jobs, alumni, and other forms of outside subsidies to athletes; and has not studied other questions relating to this subject, such as whether or not the same regulations should be applied to an institution of three hundred students as to one of twenty thousand students; and

"Whereas, The three Southern Conferences wish to collaborate with the N.C.A.A. for further improvement of conditions in athletics to the end that all institutions of comparable size shall adopt and maintain similar standards; and

Whereas, The three Southern Conferences hope that the ends toward which the N.C.A.A. is commendably working will not result in an injustice to any institution; now, be it

"RESOLVED, Therefore, that a special committee be composed of the commissioners of the several conferences, the chairman of the Compliance Committee and the President of the Association, and one representative of each district not represented by a conference, be appointed to make a complete survey of practices of member institutions of the N.C.A.A. in intercollegiate athletics and toward their athletes, and that this committee present its report at the annual meeting in 1951 with recommendations as seem to it proper and pertinent.

(Upon motion duly made and seconded, the resolution was adopted, 87 to 71.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: The next item of business before us is the submission of an amendment by Commissioner Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Mr. President, in face of everything that has happened here today, the votes that have been taken and the actions that have been taken, and particularly with reference to the action that has just been adopted, the Southwest Conference would not like to ask for the presentation of this amendment at this time, but await the deliberations of the committee further in the year.

PRESIDENT LEIB: We have had action on Amendment No. 1, withdrawn. We have acted on No. 2. We have acted on No. 3.

The next proposed amendment is No. 4.

MR. AIGLER: I hate to appear before you again, but I was asked to make this motion. I hasten to say I am not embarrassed, because I am a lawyer, of where I come from. The proposed Bowl amendment, as you remember, was quite detailed and complex. There are many of that thought, and I think the members of the Bowl Committee itself were of the opinion, that it was not a proper item that would normally be expected to be found in a constitution. It is rather in

the nature of legislation, but the Constitution of this Association makes no provision for general legislation, and so at the meeting of the Executive Committee — I am not a member of it, but I was attending the meeting — the point was discussed the other day that a study should be made of our Constitution, not in respect of the matters that we have been discussing for so long today, but rather with the mechanical features, that perhaps out of that might come some simple provision in the Constitution that would allow for By-laws, or whatever you want to call them, that could be enacted by a majority vote of the group, and in the course of the next year it appears that it should be modified, that a majority vote could make the change, leaving to the Constitution those fundamental things, statements of policy, requisites for membership, and so on.

So I offer this resolution — I think I am warranted in saying at the request of the Executive Committee, but at least at the request of some of those who are on the Committee:

"RESOLVED, That the President appoint a committee of three, the function and duty of which shall be the study of the situation in the Association structure regarding the enactment of By-laws (as distinguished from constitutional provisions) and report back at the next annual meeting, possibly with proposed amendments to the Constitution to facilitate the operations of the Association."

Now, with the simple explanation that I have made as to what is back of the motion, I move its adoption.

(The motion was seconded.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: You have heard the motion, properly made and seconded.

(The motion was put to a vote and carried.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: I will now recognize Mr. Everest of the University of Washington, who will present a proposal.

MR. EVEREST: In the light of the motion that Professor Aigler just presented and which you have just passed, and in the interest of saving time, I would like to make at this time a proposal with reference to the Rose Bowl Committee report. You will notice that this proposal carries with it a related amendment submitted by the University of Southern California, et al., and I am speaking for the University of Southern California, et al.

What I would like to propose is this: That the sponsors of this particular amendment felt that there was no such group of mortal men who had sufficient omniscience to freeze into the rigid framework of the Constitution all the managerial details that go into this Bowl report, and that was the reason for the submission of the amendment, but in the light of the motion that has just been passed, the necessity for the submission of that amendment has been obviated, and I, therefore, would like to move that the Rose Bowl report be approved in spirit, and be referred to this special committee which you have just authorized.

I so move.

(The motion was seconded, put to a vote and carried.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: May I ask Mr. Everest, what effect does that have on Amendment No. 5?

MR. EVEREST: Gentlemen, in view of that action, then, on behalf of the makers and sponsors of the amendment, I would like to ask that the amendment be withdrawn, and we do withdraw it.

PRESIDENT LEIB: If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

The next item of business is the report of the Nominating Committee. Dean Dougherty.

N. W. DOUGHERTY (University of Tennessee): The Nominating Committee met yesterday afternoon and we propose the names of the following persons for the officers of the Association:

President: Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
Secretary-Treasurer: K. L. Wilson.

Vice Presidents

First District: Lloyd P. Jordan, Amherst College
Second District: Carl P. Schott, Penn State
Third District: H. C. Byrd, University of Maryland
Fourth District: Lloyd C. Emmons, Michigan State
Fifth District: George Small, University of Tulsa
Sixth District: D. W. Williams, Texas A. & M.
Seventh District: King Hendricks, Utah State
Eighth District: Dick Everest, University of Washington

Mr. President, I place these names in nomination.

PRESIDENT LEIB: You have heard the report of the Nominating Committee. The names are placed in nomination. A motion is now in order that nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot be cast.

(A motion was made, seconded and carried that nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot be cast for the names submitted by the Nominating Committee.)

PRESIDENT LEIB: Immediately after adjournment it is required that the members of the old and new Council and the members of the old Executive Committee meet to select the new Executive Committee.

Is there any further business? Professor Willett, will you please come forward?

This is the last chance I shall have to talk to the membership of the N.C.A.A., in all probability, and I want to say to you how pleased and gratified I am that in a meeting where issues were at stake on which there was very strong feeling and deep conviction, the meeting should have been as orderly, that we should have been able to make so much progress, that there should have been the high level of attitude maintained which was maintained in this meeting. It is an extremely gratifying thing.

I want to say further what a great pleasure it has been to serve as your President for three years, and also what a great personal gratification it is to see the affairs of the Association passing into the hands of my friend Hugh Willett, who richly deserves the honor you have bestowed upon him.

PRESIDENT-ELECT WILLETT: I am sure that it is in a spirit of humility and at the same time with a feeling of keen appreciation that I accept the honor of the presidency of this organization. I have a feeling that the president during the coming year will have the bear by the tail, and I submit to you gentlemen that that is an extremely awkward position from which to guide the group to higher and better things.

We have moved slowly today, but I do feel that we have moved in a democratic fashion. However, I understand that the railroads are being run by a bunch of unsympathetic Republicans, so I shall not delay you with any speech or any statement about my aims or my philosophies, but will trust that at some future time I may be able to make my personal position clear on these controversial matters that have faced us today. I thank you very, very much indeed for the honor that you have bestowed upon me.

Is there further business to come before this Association? If not, I declare the 44th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association adjourned.

(NOTE: Due to a mechanical difficulty, the stenotype reporter who transcribed the proceedings of the Business Session, January 14, was not able to record all of the business that transpired. It is known that several minutes of discussion were not recorded by the reporter as well as the report of the Committee on Committees and the recommendations of the Executive Committee relative to transfer of membership of certain institutions. No effort has been made to insert this material into the actual transcript; but the list of the 1950 Committees of the Association, as approved, is printed on Pages 3-8 of this Yearbook and the transfers, as approved, are noted in the appropriate section of the Constitution.)

APPENDIX I

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Books and records of the N.C.A.A. for the fiscal year ended 31 August 1949 were examined and audited by J. M. Brooks, C.P.A., Evanston, Ill.

(The books and records of the Association were consistently maintained on a cash recorded basis and, therefore, the statements herewith presented do not reflect unpaid dues, accrued income or unrecorded obligations. Due to the fact that the fiscal year of the Association was changed to end on August 31 in place of November 30 in each year, only one full year has elapsed since that change was approved. Therefore the Statements herewith presented cover the full fiscal year ended August 31, 1949 as compared with only the Nine Months ended August 31, 1948. All dues of Members for the year 1948-49 as listed in the Official 1948 Yearbook and on the records of the Association have been recorded as fully paid. — K. L. Wilson, Treasurer.)

GENERAL FUND — STATEMENT OF FUNDS 31 AUGUST 1949 — 31 AUGUST 1948

	ASSETS	
	Aug. 31, '49	Aug. 31, '48
<i>Cash</i>		
Northern Trust Co. of Chicago		
Checking Account	\$ 32,145.51	\$ 43,965.31
Savings Account	5,217.45	5,156.86
Farmers & Mechanics Savings Bank, Middletown, Connecticut	3,393.82	3,326.95
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$ 40,756.78	\$ 52,449.12
<i>Advances</i>		
Golf & Basketball Tournament Expenses..	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00
U. S. Olympic Association	458.69	712.27
Sundry	90.41	920.71
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$ 1,549.10	\$ 2,632.98
<i>Investments</i>		
\$4,000 U.S. Government 2% Treasury Bonds of 1951-53 dated Sept. 15, 1943, due Sept. 15, 1953	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
\$21,625.00 U.S. Government Savings Bonds Series F, dated Jan. 1945, due Jan. 1957—Redemption value August 31, 1949 \$16,997.25	16,002.50	16,002.50
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$ 20,002.50	\$ 20,002.50
Total Assets	\$ 62,308.38	\$ 75,084.60
	<hr/>	<hr/>

	Aug. 31, '49	Aug. 31, '48
LIABILITIES AND SURPLUS		
<i>Accounts Payable</i>		
Employees' Withholding Tax collected and unpaid	\$ 250.90	\$ 151.24
<i>Surplus</i>		
Balance — Aug. 31, 1948	74,933.36	74,933.36
<i>Deduct</i>		
Excess of Disbursements over Receipts for year ended August 31, 1949, per Exhibit "B"	12,875.88	—
Balance — August 31, 1949	62,057.48	—
Total Liabilities and Surplus	\$ 62,308.38	\$ 75,084.60

	CASH RECEIPTS	
<i>Cash Receipts</i>		
Dues collected	\$ 20,765.00	\$ 1,935.00
Meets and Tournaments		
Boxing	\$ 783.55	\$ 2,243.19
Baseball	13,826.88	8,337.29
Basketball	60,848.92	62,856.11
Gymnastics	59.58	261.61
Track and Field	10,927.38	—
Swimming	781.76	1,919.82
Wrestling	229.83	4,208.74
	\$ 87,457.90	\$ 79,826.76
<i>Royalties from Publications, etc.</i>		
Basketball Rules	\$ 780.48	\$ 2,293.48
Football Rules	4,498.14	—
Advertising	5,612.53	5,000.00
Film Rentals — net	197.00	—
	\$ 11,088.15	\$ 7,293.48
Donation	—	\$ 500.00
Interest		
U.S. Government Treasury Bonds	\$ 240.00	—
Savings Accounts	127.46	133.35
	\$ 367.46	\$ 133.35
Total Cash Receipts	\$119,678.51	\$ 89,688.59

	CASH DISBURSEMENTS	
<i>Rules Committees</i>		
Basketball	\$ 2,778.05	\$ 1,655.21
Football	9,276.60	5,997.33
Boxing	124.22	199.55
Baseball	—	961.55

Fencing	208.90	135.73
Gymnastics	1,458.76	379.09
Swimming	1,917.71	1,476.30
Ice Hockey	658.80	1,166.71
Wrestling	1,396.62	590.99
Track	2,236.00	1,086.17
La Crosse	9.75	—
	\$ 20,065.41	\$ 13,648.63

<i>Other Committees</i>	.	.
Executive Committee	\$ 1,714.73	\$ 1,926.77
Eligibility Committee	371.09	19.35
Special Meetings	723.13	294.30
Constitutional Compliance Committee	4,603.78	1,000.75
Baseball Tournament Committee	108.33	—
College Committee on Physical Education	91.27	—
Bowl Games Committee	965.82	—
	\$ 8,578.15	\$ 3,241.17

<i>Meets and Tournaments</i>		
Basketball	\$ 30,424.46	\$ 31,376.68
Cross Country Deficit	642.60	1,432.30
Baseball	17,637.49	—
Golf Deficit	222.65	—
	\$ 48,927.20	\$ 32,808.98

<i>Grants, Etc.</i>		
National Collegiate Athletic Bureau	\$ 17,000.00	\$ 9,000.00
National Association of Basketball Coaches	4,719.11	1,685.24
U.S. Olympic Association Fund	1,244.64	5,765.08
Preliminary Guides	1,000.00	—
Television Survey	5,000.00	—
American Association of Physical Education	36.48	—
Official Score Book	254.31	—
	\$ 29,254.54	\$ 16,450.32

<i>General Operating Expenses</i>		
Executive Office Salaries:		
Secretary-Treasurer	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,250.00
Executive Assistant	4,281.25	2,687.59
Secretarial Assistants	4,141.14	3,046.07
Convention Expense	3,564.27	2,178.16
Membership Dues	608.50	102.00
Printing	2,784.96	2,682.50
Postage	613.78	710.27
Office Supplies & Expense	503.26	555.92
Telephone & Telegraph	1,092.60	867.16
Premium — Fidelity Bond	25.00	25.00
Rent of Office	1,846.28	900.00
Traveling & Entertainment	3,437.07	1,525.30
Office Equipment & Repairs	291.34	761.16

Professional Services	225.00	225.00
Miscellaneous	314.64	424.97
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$ 25,729.09	\$ 18,891.10
Total Cash Disbursements	\$132,554.39	\$ 85,040.20
	<hr/>	<hr/>

SUMMARY

Total Cash Receipts	\$119,678.51	\$ 89,688.59
Total Cash Disbursements	132,554.39	85,040.20
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Excess Disbursements over Receipts carried to Exhibit "A"	\$ 12,875.88	—
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Excess Receipts over Disbursements	—	\$ 4,648.39
	<hr/>	<hr/>

FINANCIAL REPORT OF 1949 BASEBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

University of Wichita, June 22-25

Receipts:

Finals	\$ 8,144.23
N.C.A.A. Appropriation	1,000.00
3rd District	150.21
4th District	87.84
5th District	258.47
Region B	40.84
Region C	111.22
Region D	366.08
Donation	75.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 10,233.89

Disbursements:

18 awards	\$ 180.00
1 gross baseballs	302.40
N.C.A.A. Baseball Committee	
Donald Frick	36.80
Frank McCormick	108.33
Frank McCormick	182.48
Lloyd Messersmith	60.35
John Kobs	121.38
Everett Barnes	172.72
Everett Barnes	11.14
Leslie A. Shaw	15.01
	<hr/>
Amount to be pro-rated	\$ 1,190.61
	<hr/>
	\$ 9,043.28
	<hr/>

Wake Forest

18 RR fares & berths	\$ 2,254.00
6 days per diem	648.00
	<hr/>
	2,902.00

St. John's				
18 RR fares & berths	2,678.04			
4 days per diem	432.00			
	<hr/>			
	3,110.04			
Southern California				
18 RR fares & berths	2,482.20			
6 days per diem	648.00			
	<hr/>			
	3,130.20			
Texas				
18 RR fares & berths	931.86			
6 days per diem	648.00			
	<hr/>			
	1,579.86			
TOTALS				
	\$ 10,722.10			
	<hr/>			
	100%			
	<hr/>			
	\$ 9,043.28			

FINANCIAL REPORT OF 1949 BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP PLAYOFFS AND FINAL GAME

WESTERN PLAYOFFS

Municipal Auditorium, Kansas City, Missouri, March 18-19

Receipts:

Ticket Sales	\$ 29,962.80
Program Receipts	548.07
	<hr/>
Total Receipts	\$ 30,510.87

Disbursements:

Promotion Expense	
Publicity Posters	\$ 40.42
Newspaper Advertising	96.60
Postage and Materials	12.00
Telephone and Telegraph	37.12
Clerical Expense	27.00
Ticket & Administration Expenses	11.22
Manager's Expenses	80.65
Headquarters	60.50
	<hr/>
	\$ 365.51

Expenses for Officials

Fees for Eight Officials	\$ 720.00
Expenses Eight Officials	570.37
	<hr/>
	\$ 1,290.37

Game Expenses

Competing teams	\$ 5,446.40
Equipment	76.80
Watches	893.55
Watch Tabs	159.50
Clocks	105.00
Moving Pictures	744.00
Buildings and Grounds	3,404.28
	<hr/>
	\$ 10,829.53

Total Disbursements

\$ 12,485.41

Net Receipts

\$ 18,025.46

EASTERN PLAYOFFS
Madison Square Garden, New York, N.Y., March 21-22

Receipts:

Ticket Sales	\$ 64,423.64
Broadcasting Rights	2,995.00
Total	67,418.64
Less N.Y. Gross Receipts Tax	134.84
Total Receipts	\$ 67,283.80

Disbursements:

Team Expense	\$ 4,148.46
Committee Expenses	1,376.04
Trophies and Prizes	1,363.76
Game Expenses	
Tournament Director	\$ 350.00
Officials Fees and Expenses	1,083.42
Special Force Personnel & Officials	2,802.15
Preparation and Cleaning	1,286.49
Entertaining Coaches and Writers	1,361.23
Publicity and Advertising	326.58
Ticket Printing	435.98
Basketballs	13.78
Tax on Tickets	81.09
Misc. Game Expense	34.00
Schedules, stationery, telephone, etc.	357.47
Public Liability Insurance	275.13
Public Address System	50.00
Marquee Signs	80.00
Payroll Taxes	167.19
Compensation Insurance	95.67
Total Expenses	\$ 8,800.18
Net Receipts	\$ 15,688.44
Less 50% rent	
Final Net Receipts	\$ 51,595.36
	25,797.68

FINAL GAMES
University of Washington, Seattle, March 25

Receipts:

Ticket Sales	\$ 32,676.00
Federal Tax Collected	6,694.20
City Tax Collected	1,673.55
Program Receipts	1,786.15
Radio and Television Receipts	1,250.00
	\$ 44,079.90

Disbursements:

Promotion Expense	
Entry Blanks and Announcements	\$ 30.29
Supplies	155.67
Clerical Expense	81.60

Postage	208.33
Telephone and Telegraph	132.02
Meetings	12.35
Newspaper Subscriptions	60.74

\$ 681.00

Ticket and Administration Expense

Printing Tickets	\$ 303.75
Ticket Sellers and Takers	165.00
Clerical Expense	401.25
Federal and City Taxes	8,367.75
Tax on Complimentaries	107.25

\$ 9,345.00

Games Committee and Officials Expenses

Four Officials' Fees and Expenses \$ 806.61

Games Expense

Watches, Tabs and Engraving	\$ 2,496.95
Basketballs	61.34
Laundry and Supplies	25.00
Public Address	44.00
Buildings and Grounds	275.00
Police and Ushers	600.50
Program Expenses, Selling and Printing	1,607.21
Car Parking	130.00
Signs	49.70
Supplemental Lighting	81.09
Team Travel and Local Transportation	5,278.06
Convention Expense	39.91

\$ 10,688.76

Total Disbursements

\$ 21,521.47

Net Receipts

\$ 22,558.43

Receipts: Summary

Western Playoffs	\$ 18,025.46
Eastern Playoffs	25,797.68
Finals	22,558.43
Fifth District Playoff	4,737.54
Transportation Rebate	4,393.98

\$ 75,513.09

Disbursements:

Selection Committee Expenses	
District 2	\$ 9.55
District 4	45.94
District 5	59.38
District 7	46.38
	\$ 161.25

Winik Film Corporation	\$ 1,000.00
Mosser-Wolf Film Co.	390.46
Trophy	219.65
Collector of Internal Revenue	584.84
Transportation (United Airlines)	9,442.00

Railway Express	4.05
Bus Transportation	32.50
Secretarial Service	100.00
Telephone and Telegraph	43.54
Stamps	6.00
Equipment	32.18
Deficit Sixth District Playoff	733.09
Fee Western Playoff Manager	350.00
Publicity	100.00
Reaves Peters, Committee Meeting (Chicago)	48.18
Tournament Committee Travel Everett Dean	\$287.57
George Edwards	54.00
Reaves Peters	244.90
A. C. Lonborg	304.96
	\$ 891.43
Headquarter's expense and entertainment	\$ 425.00
	\$ 14,664.17
<i>Net Receipts</i>	\$ 60,848.92
<i>Distribution of Net Receipts</i>	
To Competing Teams:	
University of Kentucky	\$ 4,943.97
Oklahoma A. & M.	4,943.97
University of Illinois	4,183.36
Oregon State College	4,183.36
Yale University	3,042.45
Villanova College	3,042.45
University of Wyoming	3,042.45
University of Arkansas	3,042.45
Balance to N.C.A.A.	30,424.46
	\$ 60,848.46

FINANCIAL REPORT OF 1949 BOXING CHAMPIONSHIPS

Michigan State College, East Lansing, Michigan, April 7, 8, 9

<i>Receipts:</i>	
Ticket Sales	\$ 12,045.86
Federal Tax Collected	2,548.57
Entry Fees	122.00
Program Receipts Sales	1,112.65
Advertising	243.72
 Total Receipts	\$ 16,072.80
<i>Disbursements:</i>	
Promotion Expense	
Entry Blanks, Preliminary Announcements	\$ 91.51
Publicity Folders and Posters	177.05
Other Advertising	102.38
Supplies	7.11
Clerical Expense	92.00
Postage	22.58
Telephone and Telegraph	80.26
Meetings (Committees, Press, etc.)	302.33
Welcome and Farewell Gatherings....	717.48
	\$ 1,592.70

<i>Ticket and Administration Expenses</i>	
Printing Tickets	250.20
Ticket Sellers and Ticket Takers	274.00
Clerical Expense	12.00
Federal and State Taxes	2,548.57
	\$ 3,084.77
<i>Games Committee and Officials Expense</i>	
Officials Fees and Expenses	1,170.24
Travel Expense of Games Committee	1,323.31
	\$ 2,493.55
<i>Games Expense</i>	
Awards	612.74
Gloves and Headgears	837.70
Motion Pictures and Permanent Records	547.66
Training Room, Salaries	72.81
Public Address	83.06
<i>Buildings and Ground Expense</i>	
Supplies	123.88
Labor	1,157.91
Rental	230.00
Police and Ushers	774.00
Program Expense Sellers' Commission	272.45
Printing	939.20
Local Expense	141.91
Medical	20.00
Announcer	30.00
Local Transportation	195.00
Express — Portal's Scoreboard	161.90
Local Expense of Competitors	1,704.00
	\$ 7,904.22
<i>Total Disbursements</i>	\$ 15,075.24
<i>Net Receipts</i>	\$ 997.56
<i>Distribution of Net Receipts</i>	
10% to N.C.A.A. Treasurer	\$ 99.76
Pro-Rated to Competitors for Travel Expense	897.80
	\$ 997.56
 <i>FINANCIAL REPORT OF 1949 FENCING CHAMPIONSHIPS</i>	
United States Military Academy, West Point, N.Y., March 25 & 26	
<i>Receipts:</i>	
Entry Fees	\$ 168.00
<i>Total Receipts</i>	\$ 168.00
<i>Disbursements:</i>	
Promotion Expenses:	
Entry Blanks, Preliminary An- nouncements	\$ 3.00
Supplies	50.00
Clerical Expense	50.00
Postage	3.00
Telephone & Telegraph	9.00
	\$ 115.00
<i>Games Expense:</i>	
Awards	\$ 131.19
Equipment (Electrical)	15.00
Laundry & Supplies	12.00
Program Printing	10.00
	\$ 168.19
<i>Total Disbursements</i>	\$ 283.19
<i>Deficit (Absorbed by U.S.M.A.)</i>	\$ 115.19

FINANCIAL REPORT OF 1949 SWIMMING CHAMPIONSHIPS
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C., March 24 - 26

Receipts:

Ticket Sales:	
239 @ \$4.00 (23% tax included)	\$ 846.00
325 @ \$1.00 (23% tax included)	325.00
423 @ \$2.00 (23% tax included)	846.00
	\$ 1,727.63
Federal and State Tax collected	399.37
Entry Fees	392.00
Program Receipts:	
Sales	\$ 96.90
Advertising	166.74
Total Receipts	\$ 2,782.64

Disbursements:

Promotion Expense:	
Entry blanks and preliminary announcements	\$ 63.85
Other advertising	16.00
Supplies, mimeographing	30.00
Postage	50.00
	\$ 159.85
Ticket and Administration Expense:	
Printing tickets	\$ 72.65
Ticket sellers and takers	126.50
Clerical Expense	15.00
Federal and State Taxes	399.37
	\$ 613.52
Games Expense:	
Awards	\$ 337.73
Operational Supplies	90.94
Police and Ushers	50.16
Printing Programs	518.68
Attendants and cleanup	173.00
Towel Laundry service	32.00
Public Address System	25.00
	\$ 1,227.51
Total Disbursements	\$ 2,000.88

Net Receipts

Distribution of Net Receipts	
10% to N.C.A.A. Treasury	\$ 73.18
N.C.A.A. Olympic Swimming Account	703.58
	\$ 781.76

FINANCIAL REPORT OF 1949 TENNIS CHAMPIONSHIPS
University of Texas, Austin, Texas, June 20 - 25

Receipts:

Ticket Sales	\$ 1,032.32
Federal Tax Collected	210.96
Entry Fees	441.00
Sale of Used Balls	88.95
Concessions Income	89.77

Program Receipts:	
Sales	\$ 45.00
Advertising	483.69
	\$ 2,391.69
Total Receipts	
Disbursements:	
Promotion Expense:	
Entry blanks and announcements	\$ 57.19
Publicity Folders and Posters	16.00
Supplies	10.00
Postage	36.00
	\$ 119.19
Ticket and Administrative Expense:	
Printing Tickets	\$ 34.60
Clerical Expense	10.00
Federal Taxes	210.96
Travel Expenses of Officials	69.00
	\$ 324.56
Games Expense:	
Awards	\$ 294.23
Tennis Balls	407.40
Public Address	25.00
Buildings and Grounds Expense	343.76
Canvas Rental	166.67
Ticket Sellers and Takers, also clean up crew	107.25
Program Printing	303.89
Banquet and Food	265.00
Court Surfacing	700.00
	\$ 2,613.20
Total Disbursements	\$ 3,056.95
Deficit (absorbed by Univ. of Texas)	\$ 665.26

FINANCIAL REPORT OF 1949 TRACK & FIELD CHAMPIONSHIPS
University of Southern California, June 17 and 18

Receipts:

Ticket Sales	\$ 28,390.98
Program Receipts:	
Sales	3,539.34
Advertising	1,080.00
Federal Tax Collected	6,464.68
Entry Fees	60.00
Mailing Fees	176.64
Appropriated by Southern Calif. Committee for Olympic Games for Publicity and Entertainment Purposes	3,350.00
Total Receipts	\$ 43,061.64

Disbursements:

Promotion Expense	
Entry Blanks, announcements	\$ 610.91
Publicity forms and posters	819.76
Other advertising	60.70
Supplies	53.63
Clerical Expense	547.00

Postage and mailing charges	531.34
Telephone and telegraph	229.55
Meetings	320.49
Football Writers Luncheon	100.00
	\$ 3,273.38
Ticket and Administration Expenses	
Printing Tickets	\$ 873.98
Commissions	—
Sellers, Ticket Takers	645.50
Clerical Expense	24.34
Bank Charges (Armored Car)	92.70
Federal and State Taxes	6,464.68
Supplies, ticket mailing	32.45
	\$ 8,133.65
Games Expense	
Awards	\$ 305.22
Equipment:	
Implements	252.70
T-shirts for field crew	49.44
Numbers	44.50
Ambulance	10.00
Motion pictures and permanent records	645.10
Opening ceremony	89.00
Buildings & Grounds Expense:	
Insurance	76.99
Labor and Cleanup	1,085.04
Rental	982.17
Meteorologists	30.00
Program Expense:	
Sellers Commissions	888.25
Printing	3,406.71
Publicity & Entertainment expenses underwritten by Southern Calif. Committee for Olympic Games	3,350.00
	\$ 13,554.07
Total Disbursements	\$ 24,961.10
Net Receipts	\$ 18,100.54

Distribution of Net Receipts

10% to N.C.A.A. Treasurer	\$ 1,810.05
Pro-rated to competitors for travel expenses	9,260.97
50% of remainder to N.C.A.A. Treasurer	3,514.76
50% pro-rated to competitors	3,514.76
	\$ 18,100.54

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE 1949 WRESTLING CHAMPIONSHIPS
Colorado A. & M. College, Fort Collins, Colorado, March 25 & 26

Receipts:

Ticket Sales \$ 3,982.42

Federal Tax Collected	800.08
Entry Fees	240.00
Program Receipts:	
Sales	253.75
Advertising	416.60
Total Receipts	\$ 5,692.85
Disbursements:	
Promotion Expenses:	
Publicity Folders and posters	\$ 58.52
Other Advertising	15.40
Supplies	71.62
Clerical Expense	70.00
Postage	18.20
	\$ 233.74
Ticket and Administration Expense:	
Printing Tickets	\$ 101.35
Ticket Sellers and Ticket Takers	60.00
Federal and State Taxes	800.08
	\$ 961.43
Games Expenses:	
Officials Fees and Expenses	\$ 667.45
Medals, Trophies & Express on same	371.66
Motion Pictures and Permanent Records	163.30
Training Room Salaries	45.00
Public Address	25.00
Buildings & Grounds Expense	64.43
Police and Ushers	347.30
Program Printing & Commissions	490.15
Film	15.11
	\$ 2,189.40
Total Disbursements	\$ 3,384.57
Net Receipts	\$ 2,308.28

APPENDIX II

CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

(As revised at the 44th annual convention, New York, N.Y., January 14, 1950.)

ARTICLE I.

The name of this organization shall be "The National Collegiate Athletic Association."

ARTICLE II.

PURPOSES

The purposes of this Association are:

- (1) The upholding of the principle of institutional control of, and responsibility for, all collegiate sports.
- (2) The stimulation and improvement of intramural and intercollegiate athletic sports.
- (3) The promotion of physical exercise among the students of the educational institutions of the United States.
- (4) The establishment of a uniform law of amateurism and of principles of amateur sports.
- (5) The encouragement of the adoption by its constituent members of strict eligibility rules to comply with satisfactory standards of scholarship, amateur standing, and good sportsmanship.
- (6) The formulation, copyrighting, and publication of rules of play for the government of collegiate sports.
- (7) The supervision of the regulation and conduct, by its constituent members, of intercollegiate sports in regional and national collegiate athletic contests, and the preservation of collegiate athletic records.
- (8) In general, the study of the various phases of competitive athletics, physical training, and allied problems, the establishment of standards for amateur sports, and the promotion of the adoption of recommended measures, to the end that the colleges and universities of the United States may maintain their athletic activities on a high plane and may make efficient use of sports for character building.

ARTICLE III.

PRINCIPLES FOR THE CONDUCT OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Section 1. Principle of Amateurism. An amateur sportsman is one who engages in sports for the physical, mental or social benefits he derives therefrom, and to whom the sport is an avocation. Any College athlete who takes or is promised pay in any form for participation in athletics does not meet this definition of an amateur.

Section 2. Principle of Institutional Control and Responsibility. The control and responsibility for the conduct of both intercollegiate and intramural athletics shall, in the last analysis, be exercised by the institution itself.

Section 3. Principle of Sound Academic Standards. Athletes shall be admitted to the institution on the same basis as any other students and shall be required to observe and maintain the same academic standards.

Section 4. Principles Governing Financial Aids to Athletes. Financial aids in the form of scholarships, fellowships or otherwise, even though originating from sources other than persons on whom the recipient may be naturally or legally dependent for support, shall be permitted without loss of eligibility.

- (a) if approved and awarded on the basis of need by the regular agency established in the recipient's institution for granting of aids to all students, provided, however, that the aid thus awarded shall not exceed the amount of tuition for instruction and for stated incidental institution fees, or
- (b) if approved and awarded on the basis of qualifications in which high scholarship on the part of the recipient is the major factor and such award is made by the regular agency established by the awarding institution for the making of such awards, provided, however, that the existence of such scholarship, fellowship or other aid and its terms are announced in an official publication of such institution, or
- (c) if awarded on the basis of qualifications of which athletic ability is not one, and the existence of such scholarship, fellowship or other aid and its terms are announced in an official publication of the institution.

Any student receiving aid permissible under (b) or (c) shall, however, not be awarded aid under (a) except to the extent that the aid awarded him under (b) or (c), or both, falls short of that permissible under (a).

In all cases the agency making the award of aid shall give the recipient a written statement of the amount, duration, conditions and terms thereof.

The acceptance of financial aid not permitted by the provisions of this section shall render the recipient ineligible for intercollegiate athletic competition.

- (d) Any scholarship or other aid to an athlete shall be awarded only through a regular agency approved by the institution for the granting of aid to all students.
- (e) No athlete shall be deprived of financial aids permitted by paragraphs (a) (b) and (c) of this section because of failure to participate in intercollegiate athletics.
- (f) Compensation of an athlete for employment shall be commensurate with the service rendered.
- (g) No one shall be denied student aid because he is an athlete.
- (h) Nothing herein shall, however, be construed as a disapproval of indirect aids in the form of benefits reasonably incidental to actual participation in intercollegiate athletics, such as medical attention, meals on sanctioned trips, and during officially-sanctioned practice periods while the institution is not in session, and one meal per day while on the home campus during the season of the sport in which the recipient is engaged.

Section 5. Principle Governing Recruiting.

- (a) No member of an athletic staff or other official representative of athletic interests shall solicit the attendance at his institution of any prospective student with the offer of financial aid or equivalent inducements. This, however, shall not be deemed to prohibit such staff member or other representative from giving information regarding aids permissible under Section 4.

- (b) No member institution shall, directly or through its athletic staff members or by any other means, pay the traveling expenses of any prospective student visiting its campus, nor shall it arrange for or permit excessive entertainment of such prospective student during his visit there.
- (c) No member institution shall, on its campus or elsewhere, conduct or have conducted in its behalf any athletic practice session or test at which one or more prospective students reveal, demonstrate, or display their abilities in any branch of sport.

ARTICLE IV.

MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Eligibility for Membership. Colleges, universities and other institutions of learning in the United States with acceptable academic standards which accept and observe the Principles set forth in Article III of this Constitution are eligible for membership in this Association.

Section 2. Conditions and Obligations of Membership. The members of this Association severally agree: (1) to administer their athletic programs in accord with the provisions of this Constitution; (2) to schedule intercollegiate contests only with institutions which conduct their athletic programs in conformity with the Principles set forth in Article III of this Constitution; (3) to establish and maintain high standards of personal honor, eligibility, and fair play.

Section 3. Classes of Membership.

Membership shall be of the following classes:

- (a) Active.
- (b) Allied.
- (c) Associate.
- (d) Affiliated.

(a) Active members shall consist of colleges and universities duly elected under, and conforming to, the provisions of this constitution.

(b) Allied members shall consist of athletic conferences of colleges and universities duly elected under, and conforming to, the provisions of this constitution.

(c) Associate members shall consist of institutions of learning or groups and associations of such institutions, not included among the colleges and universities eligible to active membership, duly elected under, and conforming to, the provisions of this constitution.

(d) Affiliated members shall consist of groups and associations intimately related to intercollegiate athletics in their functioning and purposes, but failing by their nature to qualify for other classes of membership.

Section 4. Election to Membership. The Association shall prescribe the procedure by which eligibility for, and election to, membership shall be effected.

Section 5. Annual Dues of Members.

(a) The annual dues of active members shall be twenty-five dollars for institutions whose undergraduate male enrollment is less than 750; fifty dollars for institutions whose undergraduate male enrollment is from 750 to 1500; seventy-five dollars for institutions whose undergraduate male enrollment is from 1501 to 2500; one hundred dollars for institutions whose undergraduate male enrollment is more than 2500.

- (b) The annual dues of allied members shall be twenty-five dollars, but no dues shall be required of an allied member when *all* of its constituents are active members of this Association.
- (c) The annual dues of associate members shall be ten dollars.
- (d) No dues shall be required of affiliated members.

Section 6. Termination of Membership.

(a) The membership of any *active* member failing to maintain the acceptable scholastic and/or athletic standards required of applicants for membership may be terminated by the vote of two-thirds of the delegates present at an annual convention, provided:

- (1) Notice of intention to move such termination, stating the grounds on which such motion will be based, is given in writing to the secretary of this Association, and to the president of such active member institution, not less than four months prior to the convention;
- (2) The Executive Committee approves the presentation of such motion to the convention; and
- (3) Such notice is included in the official notice of the convention.

(b) If any member of an athletic conference is found to be ineligible for active membership in this Association, such conference shall be ineligible for allied membership, and the membership of any such conference, previously elected to allied membership, shall be terminated.

(c) The membership of any active, allied, or associate member failing to pay the annual dues for two successive years shall be terminated.

ARTICLE V.

ORGANIZATION

A. ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

Section 1. Council.

The government and general direction of the affairs of the Association in the interim between conventions shall be committed to a Council, which shall be elected at the annual convention of the Association for a term of one year. The Council shall be constituted as follows:

- (a) One representative from each of the eight geographical districts to be elected from the faculty.
- (b) Seven members at large to be elected by the Council.
- (c) The president and the secretary-treasurer as ex-officio members.

For the transaction of business, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of the Council. The Council shall meet as follows:

- (1) Immediately after election.
- (2) At the time of the annual convention, prior to the business session thereof.
- (3) At such other times as the president may direct.

Section 2. Executive Committee.

An Executive Committee of seven shall be elected by the Council immediately following the close of the annual convention to serve for one year under the general instructions of the Council. The president and the secretary-treasurer shall be ex-officio members of the Executive Committee. For the transaction of business a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee shall represent the Council and is empowered to transact the business and direct the affairs of the Association, during the period between conventions. It may transact such part

of said business as it may deem wise by correspondence—such action, however, to be noted by the secretary in his minutes and reported to the Council and the Association at the annual convention or any prior meeting. It shall adopt a budget for the current fiscal year as soon as possible after the close of the business session of each annual convention. It shall render a report of its proceedings to the Council prior to the business session of the annual convention.

The Executive Committee shall have power to adopt Executive Regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this Constitution.

The Executive Committee, prior to the annual convention, shall appoint a Committee to Nominate Officers, and a Committee on Committees, who shall report to the convention, through the Council, nominees for officers and for the committees of the Association, respectively, for the ensuing year. It shall also appoint such other administrative committees as may be necessary for executing the provisions of this Constitution.

In case of a vacancy occurring among the officers of the Association, on the Council, the Executive Committee, or other committees of the Association, the Executive Committee by a majority vote may fill the vacancy. The person so elected shall serve until the next annual convention following his election.

Section 3. Officers.

(a) *Designation of officers.*

The officers of this Association shall consist of a president, eight vice-presidents (one from each athletic district), and a secretary-treasurer.

(b) *Election of Officers.*

The officers of the Association shall be elected at the business session of the annual convention.

(c) *Duties of Officers.*

(1) *President.* The president shall preside at the meeting of the Association, the Executive Committee, and the Council. He shall call a meeting of the Council or of the Executive Committee whenever necessary, and a meeting of the Association when requested in writing by ten or more of the active members. The president shall call a meeting of the district vice-presidents immediately following their election at the annual convention and discuss their duties with them. In the absence of the president, or in case he is incapacitated from serving, one of the vice-presidents to be chosen by him (or in case of the president's disability, by the Executive Committee), shall take his place and perform his duties.

(2) *Vice-Presidents.* Each vice-president shall represent the president in his district. He shall act as an arbitrator, to whom charges and rumors of infraction within his district of the provisions of this constitution may be referred. He shall appoint an advisory committee of three or more to assist in the performance of his duties. He shall carefully observe the conduct of intercollegiate athletics within his district and shall render a report in writing to the annual convention on the conditions of athletics in his district, with such suggestions and recommendations as he deems advisable. He shall determine the eligibility of applicants for membership within his district as provided in Article IV, Section 4 of this constitution, and shall perform such other duties as the president may designate.

(3) *Secretary-Treasurer.* The secretary-treasurer shall keep records of the meetings of the Association, the Council, and the Executive Committee. He shall report to the Association at each annual con-

vention the proceedings of the Executive Committee and the Council during the preceding year. He shall print such matter as the Association, the Council, or the Executive Committee may direct.

He shall have charge of all funds of the Association, and shall submit at the annual convention a detailed report of all receipts and disbursements, during the preceding fiscal year ending August thirty-first, which, after being audited, shall be printed in the annual *Proceedings*. This report shall be in such form as to facilitate a comparison of the items of income and expenditure in connection with the various activities of the Association during the fiscal year just concluded, with the corresponding items for the preceding year.

He shall present a proposed operating budget for the ensuing year at the business session of the annual convention for the information of the members and for purposes of general discussion. The Executive Committee shall adopt a budget for the then current fiscal year at its first meeting after the close of the business session of the convention.

B. DISTRICT ORGANIZATION.

Section 1. For the purpose of facilitating the work of this Association, the United States shall be divided into eight athletic districts as follows:

1. Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut.
2. New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, West Virginia, Puerto Rico, U. S. Naval Academy, Georgetown University.
3. Maryland (excepting U. S. Naval Academy), District of Columbia (excepting Georgetown University), Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, Alabama, Florida.
4. Illinois (excepting Bradley University), Ohio, Indiana, Michigan (excepting University of Detroit), Wisconsin, Minnesota, and University of Iowa.
5. Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Iowa (excepting University of Iowa), University of Colorado, Bradley University and University of Detroit.
6. Texas, Arizona, Arkansas, and University of New Mexico.
7. Wyoming, Colorado (excepting University of Colorado), Utah, Montana (excepting State University of Montana), New Mexico (excepting University of New Mexico), Idaho State College.
8. California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho (excepting Idaho State College) Nevada, Territory of Hawaii, and State University of Montana.

ARTICLE VI.

MEETINGS

Section 1. Annual Convention.

There shall be an annual convention of this Association during the last week of December or the first week of January, at such time and place as the Council may determine.

Section 2. Special Meetings.

Special meetings of the Association may be called by a majority vote of the Council, or by the president when requested in writing by ten or more active members.

Section 3. Quorum.

Thirty active members represented as prescribed in this constitution shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business of the Association.

Section 4. Representation at Meeting.

Each active and allied member shall be entitled to one vote and may be represented at the annual convention and at special meetings by from one to three accredited delegates.

Each associate and affiliated member shall be entitled to one delegate without voting power.

Members, as well as non-member institutions, are authorized to send visiting delegates who shall be without voting power and shall not actively participate in the business proceedings of the Association.

Section 5. Certification and Voting of Delegates.

Delegates shall be certified to the secretary as entitled to represent the member in question by the proper executive officers of their institutions or organizations.

In case an active or allied member is represented by more than one delegate, each delegate shall be entitled to cast a fractional vote which shall be in proportion to the number of delegates present representing his institution or organization.

Whenever the Association takes a formal ballot, either written or *viva voce*, on any question, the names of the delegates as they vote will be checked by the Committee on Credentials in order to verify the authority of the voter. Only accredited and not visiting delegates may vote, and not more than three representatives of either an active or an allied member may share in a proportional vote as defined in the preceding paragraph. Voting by proxy is not allowed. The same delegate may represent both an active and an allied member (that is, a college and a conference) on presenting proper credentials.

ARTICLE VII.

COMMITTEES

Section 1. Nomination of Committees.

The Committee on Committees shall report to the annual convention nominees for the following committees:

(a) *Rules Committees*: (1) Football; (2) Soccer; (3) Basketball; (4) Swimming; (5) Boxing; (6) Track and Field; (7) Wrestling; (8) Hockey; (9) Fencing; (10) Gymnastics; (11) Lacrosse.

(b) *Other Committees*: (1) Publication; (2) Preservation of College Athletic Records; (3) Tennis; (4) Golf; (5) Small Colleges; (6) Eligibility; (7) Olympic Fund Committee; (8) Baseball.

Section 2. Election of Committees.

Nominations for the committees listed in Section 1 shall be submitted at the business session of the annual convention. Other nominations may be made from the floor. In the event of a contest a formal

ballot shall be taken (either written or *viva voce* as determined by the convention) as provided in Article VI, Section 5.

Section 3. Reports of Committees.

The chairman of each committee shall report annually to the Council in writing the activities of his committee during the year.

Section 4. Publication of Rules.

Rules of play prepared by any of the rules committees shall be submitted to the Publication Committee, and on approval by the Executive Committee shall be published. Rules committees may, with the approval of the Executive Committee, arrange with other national organizations for the publication of joint rules.

ARTICLE VIII.

AMENDMENTS

This constitution may be amended at any annual convention by a two-thirds vote of the delegates present and voting; provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the secretary of the Association at least three weeks before the convention meets; and further provided that a copy of the proposed amendment shall have been duly sent to all members of the Association.

EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS

The executive regulations constitute a body of rulings covering the conduct of the business of the Association for which specific provisions may not have been made in the constitution.

I.

Order of Business (At Convention)

At meetings of this Association, the order of business shall be as follows:

- (1) Reading of minutes of previous meeting;
- (2) Appointment of a Committee on Credentials;
- (3) Reports of officers and committees;
- (4) Miscellaneous business;
- (5) Election of officers and committees;
- (6) Adjournment.

II.

Regulations Governing Conduct of National Tournaments or Meets

Section 1. The conduct of national tournaments and meets, held under the auspices of this Association, shall be under the control and supervision of the Rules Committee, if any, in the sport involved. The Rules Committee may appoint a tournament or meet committee to supervise actively the conduct of the tournament or meet.

In sports for which there is no rules committee appointed by this Association, such tournaments or meets, if any, shall be under the control and supervision of a committee appointed by the Association. Such committee may appoint a tournament or meet committee to supervise actively the conduct of the meet or tournament.

Section 2. Eligibility. The Committee on Eligibility shall have full responsibility and authority in all matters pertaining to the eligibility of athletes competing in the various tournaments and meets conducted by the Association, and shall apply the rules of eligibility established by the Association covering such participation.

Section 3. Limitation of Entries. The tournament or meet committee conducting any National Collegiate Athletic Association tournament or meet may limit the number of entries or reject any application for entry in any such tournament or meet to the end that the competition therein shall best promote the welfare and interest of the sport involved.

Institutions eligible to enter meets and tournaments of the Association are limited to those members, paid up and in good standing as of the first of the calendar year.

Section 4. Financial Reports. Reports covering the financial details of each championship meet or tournament shall be submitted to the treasurer of the Association as soon as possible following the conclusion of such meet or tournament and must bear the certification both of the chairman in direct charge of the meet or tournament and that of the rules committee chairman concerned with that particular sport. The reports are to be submitted on a form drafted and supplied by the treasurer, and are to be published as promptly as it is feasible to do so.

Chairmen of committees in those sports in which championship meets or tournaments are conducted, and persons in direct charge of such meets or tournaments, shall exercise all possible economy with respect to the payment of expenses of competitors and with respect to all other expenditures.

Section 5. Distribution of Receipts. The income from championship meets and tournaments shall be applied and distributed as follows:

(1) To pay the expenses of conducting and promoting the meet or tournament.

(2) Ten per cent of the net receipts (after deducting the expenses specified in Subdivision 1) shall be paid to the general fund of the Association.

(3) The balance of net receipts, up to the amount of the traveling expenses of competitors, may be prorated among the competing institutions. Such traveling expenses shall be limited to first class railroad fare and standard (lower berth) Pullman, with no coverage for hotel bills, meals and other expenses. In the case of track and field championships the prorating for payment of traveling expenses shall be limited to point winners in the meet.

(4) Any balance of net receipts remaining (after deduction of items specified in Subdivisions 1, 2 and 3) shall be paid to the treasurer of the Association and distributed by him as follows:

a. To repay to the general fund of the Association the amount of any deficit incurred in previous years in the sport involved.

b. If any balance remains, fifty per cent thereof shall be paid to the general fund of the Association, and fifty per cent may be prorated to the competing institutions, on a basis determined by the rules committee of the sport and approved by the Executive Committee.

Section 6. Payments to a Sponsoring Institution. No sum out of receipts of a championship tournament or meet, or from any other source, shall be paid to the college or university sponsoring or acting as "host" for such tournament or meet, except to cover expenses actually incurred in the conduct of the meet.

Section 7. Fees of Allied Members. Institutions which are not active members, but which are members of conferences which are allied members, shall pay to the meet manager an entry fee of \$10.00 for one or more entries in any national meet or tournament conducted by this Association, these fees to be credited as an item of meet receipts.

III.

Regulations Governing Finances of the Association

Section 1. General Fund. All income from membership dues or from the various activities of the Association shall be deposited in the general fund, and, subject to regulations directing its distribution otherwise, shall be available, without restriction, to pay the expenses of the Association as directed by the Executive Committee.

Section 2. Funds for Olympic Games. Funds contributed by the Association to the support of those Olympic sports for which the Association has financial and administrative responsibility shall be raised by a special Olympic Fund Committee of the Association, and from the sum so raised amounts shall be allocated to the support of these several sports. No sums from the income of the Association's

various championship meets or tournaments shall be allocated to the Olympic fund, except as the Olympic Fund Committee, with the approval of the Executive Committee, may direct.

Section 3. Expenditures. Funds of the Association shall be expended under the direction of the Executive Committee under regulations adopted by it.

(1) *Rules Committee Expenses.* The payment of expenses of the members of the several rules committees for attendance at meetings of such committees (whether held in conjunction with the national championship or tournament in the sport involved, or otherwise) shall be limited to one committee meeting per year for each committee, and shall cover only first-class railroad fare and standard (lower berth) Pullman together with a per diem allowance of \$10.00; all bills to be approved in writing by the committee chairman.

Rules committees are requested to hold their meetings in conjunction with the national championship meet or tournament (if any) in their respective sport.

(2) *Olympic Committee Expenses.* The Association shall not pay the expenses of members attending Olympic committee meetings.

(3) *Provisions for Appeal on Expense Regulations.*

To prevent hardship upon a committee or an individual committee member by the operation of the regulations governing the payment of expenses, the treasurer is empowered to make such exceptions to the general regulations in particular cases as he deems advisable.

IV.

Regulations for Determining Qualifications for Membership or Continued Membership in the Association

Section 1. Committees. Two committees shall be created as follows:

(1) *The Constitutional Compliance Committee,* consisting of three members, elected by the Association at the annual meeting upon the nomination of the Committee on Nominations, to serve for a term of three years. At the end of the first three-year term one member shall be elected for one year, one for two years, and the third for three years, so that beginning with the fourth year of the existence of this Committee one member shall be elected each year, in the manner above stated, for a term of three years. One member shall be nominated and elected specifically as Chairman.

In addition to the duties of this committee as hereinafter set forth, it is authorized to make rulings either on its own motion, or at the request of the officers of the Association or of any member institution regarding the interpretation of the constitutional language and, more particularly, to answer inquiries as to whether stated practices, actual or contemplated, are forbidden by, or are consistent with, the provisions of the Constitution. Such rulings and answers shall be deemed final and authoritative, subject only to reversal by vote of the Association in convention assembled.

(2) *The Fact Finding Committee,* consisting of three members, each member to serve only until the accomplishment of the particular task for which the Committee is activated, the duties of the Committee are set forth later herein.

The three members of this Committee shall be designated, as occasion arises for the utilization of its function, from a list of at least fifteen names, which list shall be known as "The Panel," selection of

three to be based upon the nature of the task to be performed, regard being had in each instance to the background, location and general fitness of those designated.

The Panel, from which the membership of the Committee shall, from time to time, be drawn, shall be made up by the Executive Committee. The names, thus placed on the list, shall be those of men in various walks of life, with deep interests in intercollegiate athletics. In so far as may be possible they shall be men of recognized standing, whose work and judgment may be expected to inspire general confidence as to thoroughness of investigation and soundness and fairness of judgment. Though no geographical limitations are imposed, it is expected that various parts of the nation will be represented.

One member of the Panel shall be designated in his selection as Chairman. It is expected that the person so designated shall possess, possibly in a peculiarly high degree, the qualities above stated for membership in the Panel. The Chairman shall function in the manner stated later herein.

Appointments to the Panel and as Chairman thereof shall be for the terms of three years.

Section 2. Administrative Procedure. Upon receipt of information or charges, formal or informal, by the officers of the Association to the effect that some member institution is failing to comply with the provisions of the Constitution, they shall communicate such fact, together with all information then in hand to the Chairman of the Constitutional Compliance Committee. It shall then be the duty of such committee to determine whether there is probable basis for the allegation of non-compliance; in other words, whether the situation is such that the further steps of investigation as provided for herein shall be taken.

Without attempting to declare specifically what steps shall be taken, or not taken, by the Committee, it is expected in general that:

(1) The fact of the complaint or charge thus lodged shall be brought to the attention of the responsible officer or officers of the institution involved, together with a statement as to the nature of the charge. The accused institution presumably will be allowed and expected to file an answer of admission, denial, or explanation; also, if the facts warrant it, a statement that the condition regarding which complaint has been made has been rectified.

(2) If the committee is satisfied upon such basis that there was no foundation for the original complaint or charge, or if they conclude that though there may have been sufficient basis the situation has been corrected, they shall notify the officers of the Association of their conclusion for transmission to the source of the original allegation. It is expected that the Committee will exert reasonable efforts to work out, in cooperation with the accused institution, a correction of any situation involving non-compliance with the Constitution so that the further steps hereinafter provided for may become unnecessary.

(3) If, however, the committee concludes that there is probable cause to conclude that there not only was, but is, non-compliance, the matter shall then, with all papers, correspondence, etc. be transmitted to the Chairman of the Panel and such Chairman shall be advised of the conclusion of the Committee.

(4) Upon receipt of such communication from the Constitutional Compliance Committee, the Chairman of the Panel may independently communicate again with the responsible officer or officers of the accused institution. Such communication shall call the attention of the

addressees to the then status of the matter and may invite further evidence of correction of the situation about which the complaint was made.

(5) In the absence of such further evidence satisfying such Chairman, he shall then designate three such persons from the Panel as the Fact Finding Committee referred to above to make a thorough investigation of the situation.

The members of such Fact Finding Committee shall use their judgment as to the required extent and nature of their investigation. They may conduct their investigation on the ground and any refusal or reluctance of the accused institution to cooperate fully may be taken into account by the committee in reaching its conclusion and making its report. It shall be the objective of the Fact Finding Committee to determine, as accurately as possible, the facts necessary for a fair ruling on the question presented.

(6) The Fact Finding Committee, on the conclusion of its study, shall prepare a full report of its conclusions as to the facts. It shall submit such report to the Chairman of the Panel with or without recommendation as to the ruling to be made.

(7) Upon receipt of such report, the Chairman of the Panel shall review it and forward it to the Council of the Association with his recommendation as to the appropriate action, if any.

(8) In the Council the report shall be again reviewed together with the recommendations. It shall be permissible for the Council to delegate its review to a sub-committee of its members.

(9) If disciplinary action, expulsion, suspension, or otherwise, is the final recommendation, the matter shall be referred to the Association in accordance with the requirements of the Constitution.

It is expected that all communications and proceedings, up to the time of the consideration by the Association, shall be kept in strict confidence. In case disciplinary action is taken, then such action shall be made public and shall be noted in the Proceedings of the Association.

V.

Regulations Governing Election to Membership

Section 1. Active Membership. An institution wishing to become an active member of this Association shall make application to the secretary on a form prepared by the secretary, accompanying such application with a check for the annual dues. The secretary shall determine whether the scholastic standing of the applicant meets the requirements of the Association, i.e., whether the applicant is accredited by one or more of six national and regional accrediting agencies acceptable to the Association, or listed by the Committee on Special Projects of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars as an institution offering a bachelor's degree acceptable for admission to graduate standing. If the institution is not so accredited or so listed, the application shall be disapproved and any dues paid refunded. If, however, the institution is so accredited or so listed, it shall be deemed to have satisfied the Association's requirement of acceptable scholastic standards and the secretary shall refer its application to the vice-president of the district in which the institution so applying is located. The vice-president shall then ask the Association's active members in the district to express by mail vote their opinion as to whether the applicant meets the requirements of "acceptable athletic

standards." A favorable vote by two-thirds of the institutions voting shall be required for election to membership provided the total vote cast shall represent at least fifty per cent of the total active membership of the district.

The votes of the member institutions shall be cast by the faculty athletic representative or the faculty athletic committee of the institution. In submitting such applications to vote, the vice-president shall call attention to the conditions and obligations of membership set out in ARTICLE IV, Section 2 of the Constitution.

Section 2. Allied Membership. Athletic Conferences, all of whose members are active members of this Association, may be elected to allied membership by a majority vote of the delegates present at an annual convention or by a majority vote of the Council. If an athletic conference applies for allied membership, and one or more of its institutions are not active members of this Association, the eligibility for membership of such non-member institution or institutions shall be determined under the same procedure as outlined in above Section 1 for the processing of applications for active membership. If an affirmative vote results from the said processing, the Conference then may be elected to allied membership by a majority vote of the delegates present at the annual Convention or by a majority vote of the Council.

ELIGIBILITY RULES FOR N.C.A.A. ATHLETIC EVENTS

NOTES

Any participant in an athletic contest under the auspices of the N.C.A.A. must meet *all* of the following requirements for eligibility;

Section 1. He must be eligible under the rules of the intercollegiate athletic conference of which his institution is a member, or, if his institution is not a member of any conference, then he must be eligible under the rules of his own institution. *And in addition:-*

Section 2. He must also be eligible under the following rules of the N.C.A.A.:

1. *Regular Status Rule.* (a) A student entered in an N.C.A.A. athletic event must be a matriculated student at the certifying institution. That is, he must have been admitted under the published admission rules of that institution as a regular student in a curriculum leading to a degree or comparable objective. (b) At the time of competition the student must be registered for at least a minimum full-time program of studies as defined by his institution, or if the competition takes place between terms, he must have been so registered in the term immediately preceding the date of competition.

2. *One-Year Rule.* A student is not eligible for competition in an N.C.A.A. event during his freshman year and the interval between terms at the end of that year, or before he has completed one year in residence at the certifying institution after transfer from an institution offering more than two years of college work. (See Notes 1 and 2 below.)

3. *Three-Year Rule.* A student shall not be eligible for competition in an N.C.A.A. event, if he has had three seasons of varsity competition in the sport involved. (See Notes 3 and 4 below.)

4. *Undergraduate Rule.* A student who has received a baccalaureate degree or an equivalent degree, shall not be eligible for any N.C.A.A. athletic event held after the end of the athletic season in which he received his degree. (See Note 5 below.)

5. *Amateur Rule.* A certified student must be an amateur in the sense in which that term is commonly used in American colleges. In particular, he must not have participated in athletics for money compensation.

6. *Boxing.* There are additional eligibility rules for boxing for which reference should be made to the official N.C.A.A. Boxing Guide for 1948.

Note 1. After September 1, 1947, no freshman shall be eligible for N.C.A.A. competition, *the rules of conferences or institutions to the contrary notwithstanding.*

Note 2. A veteran with at least one year of college credit need not be held for the year of residence referred to in Rule 2, if the certifying institution is the only four-year collegiate institution he has attended since his discharge from military service.

Note 3. Competition by a freshman on a varsity team between October 16, 1940 and September 1, 1947 need not be counted as one of the three seasons of varsity competition referred to in Rule 3.

Note 4. Competition by a freshman on a varsity team after September 1, 1947 must be charged as a season of varsity competition and must be counted as one of the three seasons of varsity competition referred to in Rule 3.

Note 5. For possible exception see Eligibility Rules in 1946 N.C.A.A. Yearbook and refer particulars in any case to Chairman of Eligibility Committee for ruling.

**DATES AND SITES OF
1950 N.C.A.A. MEETS AND TOURNAMENTS**

Ice Hockey — Colorado College, Colorado Springs,
March 16-17-18.

Swimming — Ohio State University, Columbus,
March 23-24-25.

Wrestling — Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar
Falls, March 24-25.

Fencing — Wayne University, Detroit, Michigan,
March 24-25.

Basketball —
Western Playoffs, Kansas City, Mo., March
24-25.
Eastern Playoffs, New York City, March 23
and 25.
Finals, New York City, March 28.

Boxing — Pennsylvania State College, State Col-
lege, Pa., March 30-31, April 1.

Gymnastics — U. S. Military Academy, West
Point, N. Y., April 1.

Track and Field — University of Minnesota, Min-
neapolis, June 16-17.

Tennis — University of Texas, Austin, June 19-24.

Golf — University of New Mexico, Albuquerque,
June 26-July 1.

Baseball — Omaha, Nebraska, June 15-22.

Cross Country — Michigan State College, E. Lan-
sing, November 27.